

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 15, 1985

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 14, 1985.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, May 15, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We remember, O gracious God, those who fill their lives with good works, reaching out to people whose names we do not know, but whose needs are great. Each of us knows people who devote themselves to helping others along life's way, whose acts of generosity and kindness are never reported and who look for no reward. We thank You, O God, for those who do their acts of mercy in a quiet and faithful way. In silent prayer we mention their names before You in appreciation for their loving concern. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will inform absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 213, nays

158, answered "present" 1, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—213

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Nowak
Anderson	Goodling	Oberstar
Andrews	Gordon	Obeys
Annunzio	Gray (IL)	Olin
Anthony	Gray (PA)	Ortiz
Archer	Guarini	Owens
Atkins	Hall (OH)	Panetta
Barnard	Hall, Ralph	Pease
Barnes	Hall, Sam	Perkins
Bateman	Hamilton	Price
Bates	Hammerschmidt	Ray
Bedell	Hatcher	Reid
Bennett	Hawkins	Richardson
Berman	Hayes	Rinaldo
Bevill	Hefner	Robinson
Boggs	Heftel	Rodino
Boland	Hertel	Roe
Boner (TN)	Howard	Rose
Borski	Hoyer	Rostenkowski
Bosco	Hubbard	Roukema
Boucher	Hughes	Rowland (GA)
Boxer	Jenkins	Roybal
Breaux	Johnson	Russo
Brooks	Jones (NC)	Sabo
Brown (CA)	Jones (OK)	Savage
Broyhill	Jones (TN)	Schumer
Bruce	Kanjorski	Seiberling
Burton (CA)	Kaptur	Sharp
Bustamante	Kastenmeier	Shelby
Byron	Kennelly	Sisisky
Callahan	Kildee	Skelton
Carper	Kleczka	Slaterry
Coleman (TX)	Kolter	Smith (IA)
Collins	Kostmayer	Snyder
Cooper	Lantos	Solarz
Coyne	Leath (TX)	Spratt
Crockett	Lehman (GA)	Staggers
Daniel	Lehman (FL)	Stallings
Darden	Levin (MI)	Stark
Daschle	Levine (CA)	Stratton
Davis	Lipinski	Studds
de la Garza	Lloyd	Swift
Dellums	Long	Tallon
Dicks	Lowry (WA)	Tauzin
Dingell	Lukens	Thomas (GA)
Donnelly	Lundine	Torres
Dorgan (ND)	MacKay	Torricelli
Dowdy	Markey	Towns
Dwyer	Matsui	Trafficant
Dyson	Mavroules	Traxler
Early	Mazzoli	Udall
Eckart (OH)	McCloskey	Valentine
Edgar	McHugh	Vento
Edwards (CA)	McKinney	Visclosky
English	Meyers	Volkmer
Erdreich	Mica	Walgren
Fascell	Mikulski	Watkins
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Feighan	Mineta	Weaver
Flippo	Moakley	Wells
Florio	Mollohan	Wheat
Foglietta	Montgomery	Whitley
Foley	Moody	Whitten
Ford (TN)	Moore	Wise
Frank	Morrison (CT)	Wolpe
Frost	Mrazek	Wright
Garcia	Murphy	Wyden
Gaydos	Murtha	Wyllie
Gejdenson	Myers	Yates
Gephardt	Natcher	Yatron
Glickman	Nichols	Young (MO)

NAYS—158

Armey	Billey	Campbell
Badham	Boehlert	Carney
Bartlett	Boulter	Chandler
Bentley	Broomfield	Chapple
Bereuter	Brown (CO)	Cheney
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Clinger

Coats	Jacobs	Ritter
Cobey	Jeffords	Roberts
Coble	Kasich	Roemer
Coleman (MO)	Kindness	Rogers
Combest	Kolbe	Roth
Coughlin	Kramer	Rowland (CT)
Courter	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Craig	Latta	Saxton
Crane	Leach (IA)	Schaefer
Dannemeyer	Lent	Schneider
Daub	Lewis (CA)	Schroeder
DeLay	Lewis (FL)	Schulze
Derrick	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner
DeWine	Livingston	Shumway
Dickinson	Loeffler	Shuster
DioGuardi	Lott	Sikorski
Dornan (CA)	Lowery (CA)	Siljander
Dreier	Lujan	Skeen
Duncan	Lungren	Slaughter
Edwards (OK)	Mack	Smith (NE)
Emerson	Marlenee	Smith (NH)
Evans (IA)	Martin (IL)	Smith (NJ)
Fawell	Martin (NY)	Smith, Denny
Fiedler	McCain	Smith, Robert
Franklin	McCandless	Snowe
Frenzel	McCollum	Solomon
Gallo	McDade	Spence
Gekas	McEwen	Stangeland
Gilman	McGrath	Stenholm
Gingrich	McMillan	Strang
Gradison	McLiel	Stump
Green	Miller (OH)	Sundquist
Gregg	Miller (WA)	Sweeney
Grotberg	Molinaro	Swindall
Gunderson	Monson	Tauke
Hansen	Moorhead	Thomas (CA)
Hartnett	Nielson	Vucanovich
Hendon	Oxley	Walker
Henry	Packard	Weber
Hiller	Parris	Whitehurst
Hillis	Pashayan	Whittaker
Hopkins	Penny	Wolf
Horton	Petri	Wortley
Huckaby	Porter	Young (AK)
Hunter	Pursell	Young (FL)
Hyde	Quillen	Zschau
Ireland	Ridge	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dymally

NOT VOTING—62

Addabbo	Eckert (NY)	Nelson
Akaka	Evans (IL)	O'Brien
Alexander	Fields	Oakar
Applegate	Fish	Pepper
Aspin	Ford (MI)	Pickle
AuCoin	Fowler	Rahall
Barton	Fuqua	Rangel
Bellenson	Gibbons	Regula
Blaggi	Holt	Scheuer
Bonior (MI)	Hutto	Schuetz
Bonker	Kemp	Shaw
Bryant	LaFalce	Smith (FL)
Carr	Leland	St Germain
Chappell	Madigan	Stokes
Clay	Manton	Synar
Coelho	Martinez	Taylor
Conte	McCurdy	Vander Jagt
Conyers	McKernan	Williams
Dixon	Mitchell	Wilson
Downey	Morrison (WA)	Wirth
Durbin	Neal	

□ 1020

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Nelson for, with Mr. Shaw against.

Mr. WORTLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EQUIPMENT INITIATIVE

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the sixth in a series of National Guard and Reserve initiatives I am pursuing deals with the problem of equipment shortages. I have recommended legislation to the Committee on Armed Services which will expand upon and reinforce an amendment to the fiscal year 1982 defense authorization bill authored by the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi, JOHN C. STENNIS. That earlier legislation required the Secretary of Defense to make an annual report providing the Congress with important information on the existing and future equipment needs of the Guard and Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, the equipment posture of the Guard and Reserve continues to be not good and not at all consistent with the total force missions assigned to them. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs has noted that the Army Guard and Army Reserve have only 52 percent of the equipment needed for their roles in a major war. I believe my legislation will help find that solution.

COMMUNIST EXPANSION IN CENTRAL AMERICA CAN BE STOPPED

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, after we voted to deny any aid to the Contras in their efforts against the Communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua, Ortega responded by saying he would send home 100 Cubans of the 8,000 advisers there, and immediately went to Moscow to reaffirm his relationship with the Soviet Union.

Since then, seven Communist Sandinista operatives have been arrested or apprehended in supplying arms across the border to Honduras.

On May 2, we had an incursion of combat-size units into Honduras by Communist Sandinistas. On May 10, we had an engagement with elements of the Honduran Army and shelling that went across the border and killed one and injured several more and caused the evacuation of several towns and villages. Just this past Saturday we had more combat-size units of Communist Sandinistas entering Honduras.

I have changed my mind about how we should deal with the Communist Sandinistas down there. I do not think any amount of pressure we bring is going to cause them to change, and in my judgment the United States should immediately break diplomatic relations with the Nicaraguan Government. We should recognize the Contras as a government in exile, and we should immediately proceed to supply \$50 million, \$100 million, or whatever amount is necessary to assure the overthrow of the Communist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. If we do anything less, we will not succeed. If we do this, we can stop Communist expansion in Central America.

VUCANOVICH OBJECTS TO COMPARABLE WORTH CONCEPT

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the issue of comparable worth. I do not believe that "comparable worth"—the notion that different jobs can be rated equal, and therefore paid equally is a workable concept.

While I am very much against the "comparable worth" proposal, I hasten to add that I do support "equal pay for equal work." I feel strongly that when an individual completes a job, he or she should be paid the market rate, without regard to the gender of the worker. Unfortunately, I fear that the "equal pay" concept has been distorted by the "comparable worth" advocates.

The concept of "comparable worth" is completely unworkable, and in my opinion detracts from the worthwhile issue of equal pay for equal work. Additionally, it is unneeded. While no one can disagree that sex discrimination still exists in some employment situations, "comparable worth" is not the answer to alleviating the problems that exist. It would only serve to create more.

Employers should be held accountable for any discriminatory acts or policies, and laws for this purpose already exist. Sex discrimination can best be remedied through legislation already enacted—the Equal Pay Act and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits job discrimination based on sex or race. We do not need any extraneous, costly legislation.

JOINT REFERRAL OF H.R. 1893 TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR AND COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H.R. 1893, heretofore referred only to the Committee on Education and Labor be

jointly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on a joint referral basis.

This bill, which amends the Walsh-Healey Act, has always been referred to both committees. The Parliamentarian's office has advised the Committee on the Judiciary that the referral of the bill solely to the Committee on Education and Labor was a mistake and that it should have been jointly referred to both committees. My unanimous-consent request is that that joint referral be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1030

HOUSE RULES SHOULD BE CHANGED TO PROHIBIT SELF-APPOINTED CONGRESSIONAL AMBASSADORS FROM CONDUCTING CONFERENCES WITHOUT DIPLOMATIC PERSONNEL

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Evans-Novak column today in the Washington Post charges that two Members of the House recently traveled to Nicaragua to consult with leaders of the Communist government there, out of the presence of U.S. diplomatic personnel. Their message presumably charged that the Nicaraguan Government had embarrassed the Democratic Party by the Ortega trip to Moscow, and it charged if changes did not occur, some more members of the Democratic Party would be forced to vote for support for the freedom fighters.

Mr. Speaker, as an outspoken advocate for military support for the freedom fighters, I personally hope their feared alternative comes to pass. But I question the wisdom of the Members engaging in closed negotiations with an openly hostile power, and I call upon both gentlemen to make totally public the full substance of their confidential discussions.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I propose the House consider changes in the House rules to prohibit self-appointed congressional ambassadors from conducting conferences out of earshot of authorized diplomatic personnel.

CONGRESS MUST BE READY TO MEET THE TRADE CHALLENGE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of records being broken these days in the area of U.S. trade with Japan. The problem is that the United

States is constantly on the short end of the stick. In March, our trade deficit with Japan hit a record level but Japan posted a record trade surplus with the United States which hit record highs. Japan's auto exports to the United States are up more than 20 percent over a year ago, thanks to President Reagan's misguided decision to lift the ceiling on auto import restraints that expired last April 1. He said when he did that, he wanted to leave it up to the Japanese to decide how many cars they wanted to ship into U.S. markets. How about that.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a game. Decisions based on a fantasy land belief that free trade with Japan still exists has cost America 130,000 manufacturing jobs since January of this year; 45,000 jobs were lost this past March alone. The people in my district are paying the price for this administration's inaction on trade. Imports are flooding our markets and eroding our manufacturing base. We get nothing from the White House but hollow clichés. We need leadership to protect American jobs and American business. If the President isn't ready to meet the trade challenge, then the Congress must.

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, President Reagan, for being a great President. Thank you, President Reagan, for giving us strong leadership, and thank you, Mr. President for giving us a budget with your ideas of how to cut that budget.

You know, my colleagues, I came back to Washington Monday morning, and laying on my desk was a summary of all of the "Dear Colleague" letters and all the resolutions that individual Members are offering for us to cosponsor that would restore this cut and that cut. Maybe it is for local tax exemptions to be restored. Maybe it is for restoring revenue sharing and those are all pretty good ideas, and I know the Members are well intentioned in offering them.

But no place in that "Dear Colleague" letter, no place in that resolution did I read any recommendation that would replace the lost revenue in maintaining the needed deficit reduction of \$50 billion. As a matter of fact if all of those recommendations to restore cuts were adopted, we would end up with no reduction in the deficit at all, and if that happens, you will see interest rates going back up to Jimmy Carter levels of 22.5 percent and inflation going back up to Jimmy Carter levels of 14 percent, which literally broke the backs of all Americans in

this country. Therefore, I've desisted to oppose all restoration of cuts, no matter how good or necessary they may be, unless there is a specific recommendation to cut elsewhere.

My recommendation for some of those good ideas that my colleagues have for restoring some of those cuts is to take it out of foreign aid; take it out of the U.N. budget and some other places.

I say to you, gentlemen and ladies: Let me hear your recommendations for restoring those cuts with like savings in the budget, and I will be glad to consider and maybe even support some of your suggestions, but don't stand up here on this floor of Congress and say "don't cut this" without also saying "cut this." Be responsible!

IRRESPONSIBLE BUDGETS

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if President Reagan is truly a leader for this country, he will begin developing fiscal policies that provide some balance. When people say, "Thanks, Mr. President, for your leadership," let us review the leadership.

This is the President who says, "I want to spend \$980 billion, but I only want revenues collected from the American people of \$180 billion less than that." He wants to give us a dollar's worth of government but only tax for 80 cents. He has added \$600 billion to the Federal debt in his short time as President.

No, I do not think that is leadership; I think we all ought to have the courage to require the taxpayers to ante up money for that which we want to spend money for in this House of Representatives. Leadership would be a budget from the White House that is more in line with what the American people want: More closely matching revenues and expenditures.

It is not leadership to lead toward the biggest deficits in the history of civilization. Both sides of this political aisle ought to have the courage to say no to this President. Budgets that call for these kinds of deficits are irresponsible budgets.

THE 92 GROUP DESERVES SERIOUS ATTENTION FROM THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, our colleague, Congressman BOEHLERT, held a special order on the subject of the "92 Group Budget: A Blueprint for Balance." It was an in-

formative and useful discussion which focused on how we can reduce the deficit by \$50 billion and achieve those reductions equitably and rationally.

Central to this deficit reduction plan is a freeze on defense spending; the only rational way, in my opinion, for us to begin to make structural changes in the deficit in fiscal 1986 and beyond. This is a timely subject since the defense authorization bill is to be debated today.

For those who fear that we are holding defense to dangerously low levels, I would direct your attention to some interesting analyses of defense spend-out; one from the Washington Post of May 12 and the series in the New York Times beginning May 14. Both of these articles point out that DOD has record backlogs—\$280 billion by reputable estimates. Even the Senate's so-called 3-percent-inflation freeze will boost spending \$61 billion—or 24 percent—between now and 1988.

Is this equity? Is it rational? When we are extracting reductions in most domestic spending areas?

That is why the 92 Group Budget with its defense freeze deserves the serious attention of the Members of this body.

CARGO PREFERENCE AND A STRONG MERCHANT MARINE?

(Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the issue of cargo preference has received increasing attention over the past several months. The debate reached its highest pitch in recent years after maritime interests successfully petitioned a U.S. district court to expand cargo preference requirements to the Department of Agriculture's blended credit program. In fact, today I am adding the names of 12 additional colleagues to H.R. 1517, which would overturn the court decision, thus bringing the total of sponsors of this legislation to 53.

Mr. Speaker, advocates of cargo preference have accused its opponents of endangering the future vitality of our merchant marine. Let me take just one moment to summarize the fruits of 31 years of cargo preference requirements:

Shrinkage of our merchant marine fleet from 3,000 to about 650, including 150 of the World War II vintage;

A merchant fleet with an average age nearing that of the normal useful lifespan of merchant vessels; and, last but not least,

A merchant fleet two to four times as expensive as its foreign counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, is this the best we can expect for the hundreds of millions of

dollars we expend on our merchant marine each year? It's high time that we adopt a policy to promote a strong merchant marine, not to keep a rust-bucket fleet above water.

LET US REINSTATE THE BADLY NEEDED R&D DOLLARS TO THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

(Mr. COURTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense authorization bill is going to be debated this afternoon; general debate about 3 hours. The strategic defense initiative is a \$26 billion research and development program that is supposed to extend over a 5-year period of time, about 2 percent of the Department of Defense authorization over the 5-year period of time.

The request that the administration had for the important strategic defense initiative was \$3.7 billion for 1986.

□ 1040

The purpose of this program, the research and development into SDI, is to see if we can move away from the destabilizing doctrine of mutually assured destruction where we threaten to annihilate civilian populations, to a defense that is based on defenses, the ability to defend ourselves and to defend human life.

It was, therefore, very discouraging to find that the Armed Services Committee cut the SDI budget by one-third for 1986, and I hope my colleagues recognize the fact that that was a mistake and as we go under the 5-minute rule, we reinstate some of the badly needed R&D dollars in that worthwhile initiative.

VIOLENCE CAUSED BY ABSENCE OF EFFECTIVE DIPLOMACY

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, last week this body passed an amendment to the State Department authorization bill expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Ambassador should be declared persona non grata, unless his Government apologized for the brutal and unwarranted murder of Major Nicholson in East Germany.

In passing this amendment, offered by my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], we were sharing the sense of outrage felt by the American people and suggesting that our Government must do something to show our displeasure with this brutal act.

And what has been the reaction of our Department of State? The State

Department has issued a press statement labeling last week's House action unwise and inappropriate.

Every student of foreign relations knows that violence is caused by the absence of effective diplomacy. But we also know the tragedy of Neville Chamberlain's diplomatic course of appeasement caused World War II.

The Soviet's action in East Germany demands both an apology on their part and a solid diplomatic response from our Government. I hope the Neville Chamberlains at the State Department realize very soon that a policy of appeasement toward the Soviets only invites more aggression and less diplomacy.

BEWARE OF WOLVES IN SHEEP'S CLOTHING

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last night on Dan Rather's early evening news, Mr. Rather interviewed Daniel Ortega and I noticed for the first time that Mr. Ortega was wearing a conservative business suit and not his military garb. Mr. Ortega just came back from a trip to the Soviet Union and to Eastern bloc countries asking for military and economic aid, and now he is dressing like one of us.

It leads me to believe that we must be very concerned. His tones have moderated, his dress has changed, and now he is talking in a conciliatory tone toward the United States of America. It brings to memory what Castro said in the 1950's when he said:

No, I am not a Communist. I want to work with the United States of America.

Two years later he said:

I am a Marxist-Leninist and have been all my life and will be to the day I die.

That is a Communist, folks. Today Mr. Ortega is sounding more like a reasonable man. We know that is not the case. He wants revolution like Mr. Castro and Mr. Gorbachev throughout Central America.

We must be wary of wolves in sheeps' clothing. That is exactly what Mr. Ortega has become.

SOMETHING ROTTEN GROWING IN THE CONGRESS

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Ortega is now making his pro-Communist case throughout Scandinavia, but there is not something rotten in the state of Denmark, there is something rotten that is starting to stink right here in the Congress of the United States. That rottenness

is the spectacle of Members from the other body and Members of this great legislative body who travel to give counsel in the capital cities of Communist states like Managua, where repressive governments are holding political prisoners in underground cells, still torturing people, persecuting religion and crushing labor unions and a free press *** governments that export revolution and terror around this world.

To have two of our Members, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. DAVID BONIOR of Michigan travel down to Managua within days of this Congress turning down assistance to the democratic resistance forces is, in this Member's opinion, a disgusting turn of events.

When U.S. Senators refuse to let the diplomatic staff of our overseas foreign embassies sit in and take notes on meetings with hostile governments, it is a sad day in the history of this Nation, and in the case of the two Members of the other body, not even reporting to our diplomatic staff in Managua before they left the country. We have now reached a new low point in Members of Congress trying to negotiate according to their own foreign policy schemes.

Mr. Speaker, there were some sanctimonious speeches before this House this week, one just yesterday by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] that said foreign policy is the purview of the executive branch of Government. The majority can't be hypocritical and have it both ways. What a disgusting display, to have Members of Congress groveling in foreign capitals to repressive regimes that bootlick Havana and the Kremlin.

I keep on my desk the May 9 Washington Post Associated Press photograph of Ortega with Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski. Some Democrats are embarrassed, others know no shame.

I submit for our record of history today's Evans and Novak column as published in the Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, May 15, 1985]

DASH TO MANAGUA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

No sooner had President Daniel Ortega flown off to Moscow than two Democratic congressmen arrived in Managua for the weekend to plead according to U.S. diplomatic cables, for help from the Marxist-Leninist regime in calming the congressional uproar over the Nicaraguan's telltale trip.

Reps. George Miller of California and David Bonior of Michigan say "no comment" on their "private conversations" with Sandinista leaders, from which U.S. Embassy officials were excluded. But cables reporting on their talks have surfaced on Capitol Hill, where we obtained them. They describe the congressmen as making the trip to "see what the [Nicaraguan] government could do to help them out of a difficult political situation in the House."

An unnamed member of the congressional delegation is quoted as advising Foreign

Ministry officials that the regime should try and hold out for three more years because things back in Washington might radically change by then, meaning a new administration in power. Departing from his "no comment" rule, Miller told us that no such statements were made.

A House Democratic leader, who did not want his name used, said he was "uncomfortable" that their weekend in Managua brought Miller-Bonior "dangerously close to negotiations." But beyond the impropriety of congressmen playing diplomat is a grosser spectacle: a symbiotic relationship between American politicians and the Nicaraguan dictatorship.

Miller and Bonior dashed off to Managua as many Democratic colleagues fretted over Ortega's mission to Moscow immediately after the House vetoed any aid to anti-Sandinista guerrillas. Miller is one of the Nicaraguan regime's most energetic supporters in Congress. He was accompanied by a staffer, Cynthia Arnson, a prominent champion of the Sandinistas, formerly employed by the left-wing Institute for Policy Studies.

The two congressmen were accorded less than red-carpet treatment. They were not satisfied by a session with Deputy Foreign Minister Victor Hugo Tinoco and failed to get an appointment with Interior Minister Tomas Borge. But they did meet Vice President Sergio Ramirez, Comandante Bayardo Arce, the regime's chief ideologist as coordinator of the Sandinista Political Committee, and Carlos Tunnermann, ambassador to the United States.

In a departure from tradition but true to the latest fashion of pro-Sandinista congressmen, U.S. Embassy officials were barred from the meetings. Miller informed the embassy he had told Ramirez the regime would have to ease censorship and allow what were termed democratic activities to keep the support of Democrats in Washington.

But reports from Nicaraguan sources, as reflected in cables being read on Capitol Hill, suggested the congressman were less interested in liberalization for its own sake than in getting themselves off the political hook back home.

One well-placed source had the congressman warning that unless the Nicaraguan government took steps toward pluralism, congressional Democrats would switch and vote aid for the contras. It was a second such source that quoted the congressman asking the Sandinistas to "help them out of a difficult political situation."

The one meeting embassy officials attended was with Jaime Chamorro, editor of the anti-Sandinista *La Prensa*. Miller told the embattled newspaperman that he had urged on government officials the necessity of freedom of the press. Chamorro was not impressed. *La Prensa* would not accept a separate agreement with the government, he said, insisting that freedom of the press must be part of a national "dialogue."

The Miller-Bonior weekend in Managua follows a pattern. When Democratic Sens. John Kerry of Massachusetts and Tom Harkin of Iowa conferred with Ortega in Managua before the House vote, they not only barred U.S. diplomats but did not even report to them after the fact, as Miller and Bonior did. The Sandinista regime's offer to sent 100 (out of 2,000) Cubans back home followed secret negotiations not with U.S. diplomats but with congressional staffers.

The pattern may be breaking, partly because free-lance congressional diplomacy is stirring bipartisan distaste. Bernard Aron-

son, a Democratic insider and campaign adviser to Geraldine Ferraro last fall, writes in the current *New Republic* that his party should promise military support for the armed democratic resistance if all other efforts fail. That advice is the antithesis of Democrats, pursuing cosmetic Sandinista "pluralism" while urging the *comandantes* to hang tough until the next American presidential election.

THE NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

(Mr. CARPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a bill which would establish a national program to address severe threats to one of our Nation's most valuable national assets—our estuaries, those areas where rivers meet the sea.

Like many of my colleagues, I represent a State that is intimately tied to its marine environment. Indeed, there is no part of Delaware which is more than 35 miles from its coastal waters. Our Nation's estuaries are the prime nursery grounds for commercial and recreational fisheries; they provide unmeasurable recreational benefits; and, if properly managed, represent tremendous economic opportunities.

Yet, the pressures on estuaries around the country are staggering—many of us want to live near the water, industry wants access to cheaper marine transportation, utilities need large volumes of water to cool their reactors, and many folks, unfortunately, dump their waste into our water, hoping that nature will flush the mess out of sight and out of mind.

This bill would coordinate Federal, State, and local efforts to identify and properly manage estuaries of prime importance.

I urge my colleagues to study and hopefully support this worthy environmental initiative.

STATE DEPARTMENT SHOULD GET MAD AT SOVIET UNION

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has finally gotten tough. They have finally gotten mad enough at somebody to use some tough language against them, and who did they get mad at? They got mad at the over 300 Representatives in the House who voted the other week to have a resolution, an amendment, that would force the Soviets to apologize for shooting Major Nicholson or have Ambassador Dobrynin thrown out of the country.

That made the State Department mad. I find this hard to understand, that they would endorse in the same

press release where they got mad the toothless resolution we had on the floor before. Yet we had a resolution out here that condemned the murder of Major Nicholson. It was absolutely toothless, but you end up with a resolution that does something and says we ought to do something about it and then the State Department gets mad.

It seems to me that what we need is a State Department that gets mad at the Soviet Union and not at the House of Representatives.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1872, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1872) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and to the amendment made in order by this resolution and which shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, said substitute shall be considered for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. All points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI, clause 5(a) of rule XXI, and section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. No amendment to the bill or said substitute shall be in order except amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After the bill has been considered for amendment in its entirety, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1985, by, and if offered by, Representative DELLUMS of California, said amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered, shall be debatable before consideration of amendments thereto for not to exceed one hour, to be equally di-

vided and controlled by Representative DELLUMS and a Member opposed thereto, said substitute shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI, are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1872, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. The resolution provides for 3 hours of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The resolution makes in order consideration of the Armed Services Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as original text for the purposes of amendment. The substitute is to be considered by title rather than by section and each title shall be considered as read. Germane amendments to the bill are in order as long as they have been printed in the RECORD prior to being offered and do not otherwise violate the rules of the House or of the Budget Act.

Section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which prohibits consideration of legislation which authorizes appropriations for a fiscal year unless the bill has been reported by May 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year, has been waived.

The waiver was necessary because section 902 of H.R. 1872, as introduced, authorized the appropriation of an additional \$100 million from the special defense acquisition fund, effective in fiscal year 1985. Since H.R. 1872 was not reported by May 15, 1984, section 902 of the bill causes the bill to be in violation of section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

The substitute reported by the Armed Services Committee deletes the provisions of section 902; however, the waiver is still necessary in order that the bill and the proposed committee amendment be considered.

The rule also waives clause 7 of rule XVI against consideration of the committee substitute. Clause 7 of rule XVI prohibits consideration of nongermane amendments. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute expanded the scope of the bill as originally introduced. The bill as originally introduced was a 1-year Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1986. The committee substitute, however, proposes numerous such amendments to permanent law and contains authorizations for the Department of Energy's national security programs which were not included in the introduced bill. Therefore, the Committee on Rules recommends waiving the germaneness rule to allow for the consideration of the Armed Services Committee substitute.

Section 401(a) of the Budget Act is also waived by the rule. Section 401(a) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of any legislation which provides new contract authority unless such authority is limited to amounts stipulated in appropriation acts. Section 107 of the committee substitute provides the Secretary of Defense with authority to enter into a contract for the procurement of 5-ton trucks. Since this new contract authority is not limited by advance appropriations, a waiver of section 401(a) of the Budget Act is necessary.

However, Mr. Speaker, this waiver is merely technical in nature. The Armed Services Committee intends to offer an amendment to the substitute which would limit the Secretary's contract authority to amounts provided for in appropriation acts.

House Resolution 169 also waives any points of order which may be raised against the bill for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI. Clause 5(a) of rule XXI prohibits consideration of measures containing appropriations which are reported by authorizing committees. Several provisions of the bill provide for new uses of previously appropriated funds, waive limitations on outstanding funds, or might otherwise be construed to be an appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, following the consideration of all other amendments to the bill, the rule specifically provides for consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1985, by Mr. DELLUMS of California, with the substitute to be considered as read. To permit an adequate opportunity for debate on this alternative national defense policy, the rule provides 1 hour of debate to be equally divided between Mr. DELLUMS and a Member opposed to his substitute. All points of order against the amendment for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI, that is, the rule prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill, have been waived. The committee had been

informed that this waiver was necessary. Subsequent to reporting this rule, however, we have been informed that the Dellums substitute does not violate clause 5(a) of rule XXI.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1872 authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for weapons systems procurement; ammunition and other procurement; research and development; testing and evaluation; and operation and maintenance. It also authorizes appropriations for working capital funds; civil defense; the Department of Energy's national security programs; personnel and military training. A 3-percent basic pay increase effective January 1, 1986, is included in the bill, as is a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to submit a proposal to change the nondisability retirement system for new entrants.

Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 1872 may be somewhat controversial, House Resolution 169 provides for a fair debate of issues raised by the bill. I urge that Members adopt the rule so that we may proceed to consideration of this important measure.

□ 1100

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure. The Defense Department authorization needs to be passed. But since I have been on the Rules Committee, I have never seen a rule granted in this fashion. The Rules Committee granted this rule knowing full well that after the general debate and after consideration of the budget resolution that they would have to come back and get a waiver, which will be a second rule on the same bill. If that sounds confusing, it certainly is.

I know, in the past, the Rules Committee has reported out rules that have passed on the floor and then come back to the Rules Committee to make a correction in what they did, but never knowing in advance that a second rule would be required.

As I said, this is an important measure. I think our defense posture should be second to none in this world of ours.

I understand that the Budget Committee is going to make further cuts than the Senate made in the defense area.

In the debate under the 5-minute rule, I think there will be ample time to resolve the differences.

Mr. Speaker, I have one request for time, but before yielding 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH], I would like to urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

THE BUDGET DOCUMENT

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am a brandnew member on the Budget Committee this term. I am just here to express my real disgust and unhappiness with what is happening today. It is just shortly after 11 o'clock this morning and we have no document from the majority side on the budget. We understand that we are supposed to go into markup at 1 o'clock, having been given a caucus-directed position, apparently, the Democrat leadership.

I just would like to read a letter that I was sent by the chairman of the Budget Committee, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], and he said:

It remains my hope that we will be able to complete our work by the April 15 deadline, but the current week and early Easter are working against us. As we sit down and actually begin to polish the budget resolution, I truly hope that you and some of your colleagues on your side of the dias will join me and some of those on my side in a bipartisan resolution that will truly make a beginning at getting this deficit down over a period of three years or so.

Now, I do not really think that this is going to work together, not having a document, being called into the Budget Committee at 1 o'clock to start a markup. This is more business as usual. I just think it is important that the American people understand that here we are with this kind of a situation, facing 2 hours with no documentation. That is not exactly working together.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that this is his first year on the committee. He has done a tremendous amount of work in preparation for the debate that hopefully will take place at some point in the committee.

This is now my third year on the committee and what we are getting ready to do, or at least what we have been told, is an instant replay of the last 2 years. It seems like Chairman GRAY is going to really begin the same process that Chairman JONES did a couple years ago.

I think maybe it would be helpful, I keep getting mixed signals that we are going to meet at 1 o'clock and then someone said we are going to meet at 2 o'clock; someone indicated that we would have the markup document 45 minutes ago.

I would suggest that before we get involved in a markup of the budget of the United States, that is probably the question that is most concerning

people today, that we ought to at least have a little time to look and see what is in that before we even go into the process of debating it; which leads me to my final point.

Maybe there is not any intent that there be any debate to take place on that document. Really what is going to happen is that it is going to be put down in front of us about an hour before markup. It is going to be passed by the majority party and swept out of the way and on we go with business and we are going to bring the Defense Department authorization bill up before the Budget Committee even has a chance to act.

It seems to me that there is total disregard, not only for what the minority rights are, but for the entire process around here.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I certainly agree. Certainly this is not working together to try to accomplish the best thing for this country and this budget.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the thing that disturbs me so much as a member of the Budget Committee is that we are dealing with nearly a trillion-dollar budget. There are a tremendous number of components to it. There are thousands and thousands of provisions that are involved in it and yet we are going to be asked to vote without even having had a chance to read the various components of this budget.

It is no wonder that we find ourselves in the situation of deficits to the level that we have, because nobody knows what is going on. Here we are waiting for a budget which could have been produced days ago; instead, just a few minutes before we are actually going to have to vote on this. If we are lucky, it is going to be put into our hands.

Well, that is part of the irresponsibility that is tradition around this House, controlled by the majority. They do not want anybody to know what they are going to do until the last minute. In fact, I am not certain that they know what they are going to do until their budget is actually put into print.

They ask the rest of the Members of Congress who have to make these decisions to be involved in the decision-making process without giving us any information.

Well, I would call on the chairman of the Budget Committee, Chairman GRAY, to come to the floor to tell us what is included in his document, to give it to the members of the committee and to give us until perhaps next week to actually have a chance to sit down and go through it.

I mean, it is no wonder that we have the disarray that we do.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank my colleague.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] for an update on this situation.

When is the last time we had a meeting, I would ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], of the Budget Committee?

Mr. LATTI. Well, it has been some time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the American people who ought to know what is going to happen to them in this body, the House of Representatives, here for months now the Democratic majority has been lying in the bushes, shooting at every reduction proposal that the administration or the Republican-controlled Senate has proposed in the budget. They have had a field day. They have not had to show their hand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI].

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, we have had all this time for our Democratic friends to examine every proposal that has been made by the administration on budget reduction; the same with the Senate, but now they hand us a document that was conceived in the nighttime on the Democratic side and say that at 1 o'clock today we are going to start markup on a \$970-plus billion document.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that, \$970 billion in this one document, and they say we start markup at 2 o'clock—or 1 o'clock. Whether the time might be 1 or 2, what makes the difference? We have not had an opportunity to examine it. The American people have not had a chance to know what is in it, but they are calling on us, and we only have 13 members, we are outnumbered 20 to 13 on that committee, to examine the document and say: "We want you to vote on it function by function this afternoon."

Now, I think the American people deserve better treatment in this, their House, their House of Representatives. I do not care whether the Democrats control it or whether the Republicans control it. Better treatment is deserved in this, the people's House, and what we are getting in a \$970 billion document.

Oh they are saying: "Yes, we are coming up with \$56 billion in reductions."

Out of what? Two hundred thirty billion dollars of planned deficits for

fiscal year 1986, to be heaped on top of a \$1 trillion, 800 billion worth of debt?

This budget presented to us is taking 15 cents out of every dollar of taxpayers' money just to fund the deficit. Yes, they want us to start marking up this document, the budget document of \$970 billion this afternoon, when we get it 2 hours in advance.

□ 1110

Now, I don't think that is treating the American people in the right and proper way. I would call on our friend, and I do not know who is controlling the time other than the chairman, but for the Democratic majority to do this to the American people—but this is their House. They are going to pay the price. Our grandchildren are going to pay the price for what they have been doing: Lying in the bushes, as I mentioned earlier, for months, shooting at every proposal that has been put forward to reduce this deficit. And now they come forth with their plan and say we are going to vote on it this afternoon, item by item.

I just do not think that is proper, and I think it is high time we shine the spotlight of public attention on what is happening.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. WEBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the ranking member from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] has made an important point.

But it is even worse than that because not only have the Democrats decided that they are going to bring the budget to us without virtually any prior consideration at all but, as we understand it, it is all going to be passed through the committee this afternoon. There is not going to be several days of deliberations. We are not going to have a great deal of debate on any of the different functions. It is slam, bam, thank you, ma'am, and we are going to be all done with it, and the Congress is going to go home over the weekend and we will never discuss the budget. We do not know what the assumptions are. We do not know how you get the \$56 billion. We do not know what the impact is of making a further reduction in the national defense, and we are never going to find out because it is all going to be pushed through this afternoon.

Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That is what we have been told so far. I think that we are due an explanation from the majority side.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could move for a call of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman was not recognized for that purpose. As I understand it, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLIN] still has the time.

Mr. WEBER. No; he yielded to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman for that purpose. There is no requirement that the Chair recognize a Member for a call of the House during general debate.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding out of order under unanimous consent.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, this is not general debate. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is speaking out of order under a unanimous-consent request, and the Speaker did recognize him before. So, therefore, it is not a part of general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DENNY SMITH) there were—yeas 12, nays 14.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 65, nays 331, not voting, 38 as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—65

Archer
Badham
Broomfield
Campbell
Chapple
Cheney
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Daub
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Emerson
Fields

Goodling
Gradison
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Hiler
Hunter
Jeffords
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Livingston
Loeffler
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McGrath

Michel
Murphy
Myers
Pashayan
Quillen
Rinaldo
Rogers
Schneider
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Smith (NE)
Solomon
Sweeney
Thomas (CA)
Walker
Whitehurst
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—331

Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Armey

Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman

Bates
Bedell
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman

Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehrlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonner (TN)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Filippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Frost
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Guarini

Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hefter
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lott
Lowry (WA)
Lukens
Lundine
Mack
MacKay
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinar
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)

Mrazek
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielsen
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solaz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky

Volkmer	Whitley	Wright
Vucanovich	Whittaker	Wyden
Walgren	Whitten	Wyllie
Watkins	Williams	Yates
Waxman	Wilson	Yatron
Weaver	Wise	Young (MO)
Weber	Wolf	Zschau
Weiss	Wolpe	
Wheat	Wortley	

NOT VOTING—38

Addabbo	Durbin	Oakar
Akaka	Evans (IL)	Pepper
Alexander	Fish	Pickle
Applegate	Fowler	Regula
Barnard	Fuqua	Scheuer
Barton	Hawkins	Shaw
Bellenson	Hutto	Smith (FL)
Bonior (MI)	LaFalce	Stokes
Bonker	Manton	Synar
Chappell	McCurdy	Taylor
Dicks	Mineta	Vander Jagt
Downey	Nelson	Wirth
Duncan	O'Brien	

□ 1130

Messrs. SCHAEFER, PARRIS, McKINNEY, LIPINSKI, DAVIS, ROSE, PEASE, GONZALEZ, and KASICH changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ECKERT of New York, SOLOMON, EMERSON, LOWERY of California, and CRAIG changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 18 minutes left. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] has 24 minutes left.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, though there appears to be contention on a number of things in the House of Representatives, one of them does not appear to be this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he has further requests for time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I do have one request for time.

Before yielding to the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to emphasize a statement I made earlier. This is an open rule, with 3 hours of general debate, and there is no time limit under the 5-minute rule.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was allowed to speak out of order.)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because the Chairman of the Budget Committee is on the floor to express my own personal outrage at what I have perceived to be happening here: An attempt to prevent an adequate debate and airing of the whole budget process.

It is my understanding that there was to be a markup of the Budget Committee this week, and that was

perfectly in order, although that had been somewhat expedited because the other body had moved along a little bit more expeditiously than some people might have thought. Then when I find out while there is very little to be discussed here on the floor of the House, or really to take up the time of the House, that we are having our Members called to a Budget Committee markup meeting for I think 1 o'clock with no document available; not even gone through the process of CBO. To think that they are supposed to begin the markup of this thing at 1 o'clock with the expectation of concluding by tonight on a \$900 billion document. I just think that is outrageous.

Now, we are going to have an opportunity, surely to debate that measure here on the floor of the House I would hope extensively, and there are groups that would like to offer their amendments, but we must subvert or completely do away with the committee process here. I would like to hear from our Budget Committee members—I would like some kind of explanation of what is going on here.

□ 1140

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to try to answer some of the questions he has raised.

First of all, let me just say that, as chairman of the Budget Committee, we certainly are not trying to subvert the process. I think most of the Members from the gentleman's side of the aisle would clearly say that, over the last 4 months, we have had a very good, open relationship. We may not agree on certain aspects of the budget priority or process. But my office has been available, my door has been open, and particularly to the ranking minority leader from the gentleman's side of the aisle. In fact, last night, when the Chair finally came to the point of knowing what his mark would be, which was approximately 9:30, he went over and met with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] to talk about a markup procedure, a time. One of the things that I was not able to provide, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] asked for, was a chairman's marked document. I informed the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] that it was being printed, that the staff had just left my office, and we would put it together and it was my hope that by 10:15 this morning it would be finished and the gentleman would have copies of it. It was not finished until about 10:45, and I asked the staff to bring it over to a meeting where the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] was meeting.

The second thing, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] and I discussed the markup time, going to markup. And he advised me that this morning

there was a meeting of the Republican leadership and that there was no possibility of doing a markup, starting that process this morning, and that we would have to go in the afternoon. It was my understanding, when I left Mr. LATTI's office at about 10 or 10:15, after being there over 30 minutes, that we had agreed on 1 o'clock as the beginning of the markup procedure. As the distinguished leader knows, that procedure begins with an overview of the mark by staff, questions being raised, the economic assumptions, and that usually goes on for a minimum of an hour before we even turn to the actual markup of function by function.

Now, if the minority side is making a request to me as chairman of the Committee on the Budget to delay that markup so that they can have more time, I would simply say to the distinguished leader that there is no need for that request to be made on the floor of the House; I would have welcomed a telephone call or a visit from the distinguished ranking minority Member and would have considered that request.

So if the minority side is saying to the Chair, "We would like a little more time," as I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio has just said to me that he believed that he had agreed to 2 o'clock, then, fine, let us begin at 2 o'clock.

Let me describe to the gentleman the markup procedure so that we will all be clear: Usually, the Chair gives a 1-minute introductory comment. We ask the professional staff to sit at the witness table, to go through the Chairman's mark, and Members of both sides of the aisle are allowed to ask questions of the staff about that mark and then, after about an hour or so of doing that, we then move to the markup, starting with function 050, defense, moving through function 150, all the way to function 950.

I would simply say that I cannot, for the life of me, in light of the very cordial relationship that I have had with the minority members of the Budget Committee, and particularly the close relationship that I have had with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], where we have taken the committee out across the country on 12 hearings, why there would be such a public commotion, when all that was needed was a private telephone call for us to agree to the needs of the minority.

So if you want to start at 2 o'clock, I will be glad to start at 2 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have the highest regard, and he and I have talked about this long ago in private, frankly, I was given to understand, within just a day or so, from my ranking Member, that it was going to be rather a deliberate markup, one that would give Members an opportunity to air their differences of opinion. I guess this gentleman, along with some others who have some responsibility for attempting to orchestrate the procedure by which we consider this on the floor, that we would know what kind of amendments or substitutes ought to be considered or in order, and that normally does not get aired well enough unless you have got a decent period of markup during the committee.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just simply say that there would be ample opportunity for Members on the minority side to offer their amendments in the markup process, going function by function, and at the end of the markup to even do omnibus amendments.

This chairman has, I believe, consistently set forth a standard of fairness, which I think the majority of the Members on the minority side can attest to.

Mr. MICHEL. I will take the gentleman at his word.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I pledge myself to continue fairness and openness in the markup process. However, I would like to just say that the Senate has acted. I commend Mr. DOLE and Mr. DOMENICI for their action. They have come forward with a significant reduction package. I believe that what we ought to be doing, rather than debating publicly, let us work together, let us move quickly, expeditiously, to a markup, and bring to the floor a budget which I hope will be bipartisan in nature, and what we will do if we rapidly do that, rather than the kind of unfortunate circumstance today, we will show America that we in the House, like the Senate, are prepared to move forward and reduce these tremendous deficits that have increased the national debt from \$914 billion in 1980 to \$1.8 trillion today. That is the Chair's goal. I am sure the gentleman shares that, and I will be glad to delay until 2 o'clock and work to provide the opportunity for the minority side to offer whatever amendments they would like to offer.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Let me reclaim my time to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] for whatever observations he wishes to make.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the relationship that the Chair has ex-

pressed, as far as the minority is concerned, and especially with this Member and the meetings we have had. As far as the vote we just had here, I had nothing to do with that.

Let me just say that, in view of the fact that there is \$970 billion in the document that is being put forward that came out last night, I just kind of think that we ought to have a little bit more time.

The gentleman has stated that he did promise, that last night he did indicate we were going to get it at 10:15. We got it approximately at 11 o'clock. I had to make I do not know how many calls, and I ended up talking with the chairman himself, to finally get the document at 11 o'clock. In the call before I called the chairman, I was talking to the chief staff person and he said it was going to be an hour, it was going to be 12 o'clock, and they were saying we were going into session at 1 o'clock to mark up the document.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, how much additional time would the gentleman need before going to markup? Is the gentleman talking about 15 minutes, 30 minutes, 1 hour, 2 hours? The gentleman made a request to me just a moment ago that he wanted 2 o'clock. I have now bowed to that request that the gentleman wanted 2 o'clock. Now I hear another request. Could I ask, what is the request that is being made and what is the reason why accomplished, skilled legislators whom you have elected to serve on the leadership committee of the budget, who know this process well, are not able with their professional staff, their associate staff, to be able to grasp the budget questions and work off the chairman's mark?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has again expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

□ 1150

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, sure, we can mark this budget up; we are familiar with the process. We could go in at 12 o'clock and start marking it up. But there are the American people out there who are interested in this budget, and as far as I know, this has not been submitted to CBO. Has it, Mr. Chairman? Has this budget been submitted to CBO, and we have required every budget that is presented to be submitted to CBO?

How I ask the gentleman to answer the question: Has the product that you came out with last night been submitted to CBO?

I yield to the gentleman for his response.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I would respond to the gentleman from Ohio by saying, no, it has not. But neither

was the budget on the Senate side, before they went to markup. I did not know that the budget rule now requires that we submit a chairman's mark to CBO before we go to markup.

In fact, I never knew that applied to Mr. DOMENICI on the other side. The question that I would wonder about, in light of the fact that the No. 2 leader on your side of the aisle, I think just this week or last week, was on the floor publicly saying that we were moving too slow on the budget last week.

Now, I will be glad to get his remarks out of the RECORD, but Mr. LOTT, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, last week was urging the majority to move forward on the budget. We are trying to comply with Mr. LOTT's request. We are trying to send a message to America that we want to reduce the deficit. I do not understand what the problem is.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, since the chairman has taken most of my time, I would like to say that even though we can mark this up in committee; we know the process; we know what is involved, but do the people know?

You are not going to release it until 1 o'clock to the press. You know, they shot at every proposal that has been made by the administration, every proposal that has been made over in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. I think in all fairness we ought to have an opportunity. We still have that free press; maybe they just might print something that is in there. Even in the morning Post they indicated that they did not know what was in it. I think in all fairness we ought to go a little slower.

Sure, we could turn the product out tonight.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. No, I am not going to yield further. You have used a lot of my time, Mr. Chairman, and we only have 2 minutes.

But certainly tomorrow, you know, we will have another day tomorrow, hopefully. What is wrong with coming in tomorrow and not rushing this thing through tonight into markup stage?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, I would just say to the gentleman that if we could stop this rather unnecessary discussion, maybe he could go and study the docu-

ment and be prepared to talk about it, rather than for us to go through this unnecessary discussion.

It seems to me that the minority side has selected 13 people of outstanding ability; people like Mr. LATTA, the author of Gramm-Latta, which came to the floor overnight with telephone numbers in it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am on my own time now, and I only have a couple of minutes.

You have got a 20-to-13 ratio in that committee. If any motion is made, and it falls on party lines, we know what the outcome is going to be, and that means a limit of time, shutting off of debate, and jamming that thing through within a very constricted period of time. I am aware of that.

I see the smile on the majority leader's face; I am reminded of him taking the floor down here with a big document called "Reconciliation;" you do not know what is in it.

Well, I will tell you, that cuts both ways. Do you really know what is in that document over there, the 20 of you who have got to mark up this afternoon, if that is what you are going to do?

I am just saying I think it deserves the public light of attention on just what your mark is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LOEFFLER].

Mr. LOEFFLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond for just a moment to say to the majority that today is May 15.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has expired.

The Chair wants to advise the Members that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN] has 3½ minutes left and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT] has 23½ minutes left.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, though I hesitate to cut off this very interesting debate on the rule for the Department of Defense authorization, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI].

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today is National Peace Officers Memorial Day, a time to pay a special tribute to those courageous members of our law enforcement community who have died in the line of duty. The day will be marked by a ceremony in Senate Park at noon today that will bring together the survivors of the 137 police officers who died in 1984. I am hopeful that many of my colleagues will join me today in attending that event, especially since one of those officers killed last year was U.S. Capitol Police Sgt. Christopher Eney, who for 12 years served us in an admirable fashion.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, some 1,600 brave police men and women, like Sergeant Eney, have died in the line of duty. That is nearly one police death every 2 days. Just yesterday, in fact, a 23-year veteran North Carolina State trooper, Raymond Earl Worley, was shot to death by the occupants of a van he had stopped along an interstate highway. Tragically, it seems that the frequency of these senseless killings has turned us into a society that has come to expect police deaths, and all too often, expectance breeds acceptance. But, that is wrong!

Last year, this Congress enacted a law I was proud to author, that allowed a national law enforcement heroes memorial to be built in Washington, DC. Efforts are now underway to erect that memorial. The memorial will pay a richly deserved and long overdue tribute to all Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. It will also serve as a constant reminder of the critical need to better protect those who continue to protect us.

□ 1200

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, while there appears to be ample controversy this morning, there has been none on this rule for the Department of Defense authorization. I would, therefore, move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 25, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—366

Ackerman	Biaggi	Campbell	Jones (TN)	Pursell
Anderson	Billirakis	Carney	Kanjorski	Quillen
Andrews	Bliley	Carper	Kaptur	Rangel
Annunzio	Boehlert	Carr	Kasich	Ray
Anthony	Boland	Chandler	Kastenmeier	Reid
Applegate	Boner (TN)	Chapple	Kemp	Richardson
Archer	Borski	Cheney	Kennelly	Ridge
Armey	Bosco	Clay	Kildee	Rinaldo
Aspin	Boucher	Clinger	Kindness	Ritter
Atkins	Boulter	Coats	Kiecicka	Roberts
Badham	Boxer	Coble	Kolbe	Robinson
Barnard	Breaux	Coelho	Kolter	Rodino
Barnes	Brooks	Coleman (MO)	Kostmayer	Roe
Bartlett	Broomfield	Coleman (TX)	Kramer	Roemer
Bateman	Brown (CA)	Collins	Lagomarsino	Rogers
Bates	Broyhill	Combest	Lantos	Rose
Bedell	Bruce	Conte	Leach (IA)	Rostenkowski
Bennett	Bryant	Cooper	Leath (TX)	Roth
Bentley	Burton (CA)	Coughlin	Lehman (CA)	Roukema
Bereuter	Bustamante	Courter	Lehman (FL)	Rowland (CT)
Berman	Byron	Coyne	Leland	Rowland (GA)
Bevill	Callahan	Craig	Lent	Roybal
			Levin (MI)	Rudd
			Levine (CA)	Russo
			Lightfoot	Sabo
			Lipinski	Savage
			Lloyd	Schaefer
			Loeffler	Schneider
			Long	Schroeder
			Lott	Schutte
			Lowery (CA)	Schulze
			Lowry (WA)	Schumer
			Lujan	Seiberling
			Lukens	Sensenbrenner
			Lundine	Sharp
			Lungren	Shelby
			MacKay	Shumway
			Madigan	Shuster
			Manton	Sikorski
			Markey	Sisk
			Marlenee	Skeen
			Martin (NY)	Skelton
			Martinez	Slattery
			Matsui	Slaughter
			Mavroules	Smith (IA)
			Mazzoli	Smith (NE)
			McCain	Smith (NJ)
			McCloskey	Smith, Denny
			McCollum	Smith, Robert
			McDade	Snowe
			McEwen	Snyder
			McGrath	Solarz
			McHugh	Solomon
			McKernan	Spence
			McKinney	Spratt
			Meyers	St Germain
			Mica	Staggers
			Michel	Stallings
			Mikulski	Stangeland
			Miller (CA)	Stark
			Miller (OH)	Stenholm
			Miller (WA)	Strang
			Mitchell	Stratton
			Moakley	Studds
			Mollinari	Stump
			Mollohan	Sundquist
			Monson	Sweeney
			Montgomery	Swift
			Moody	Tallon
			Moore	Tauke
			Moorhead	Tauzin
			Morrison (CT)	Thomas (CA)
			Morrison (WA)	Thomas (GA)
			Murphy	Torres
			Murtha	Torricelli
			Myers	Towns
			Natcher	Trafficant
			Neal	Traxler
			Nichols	Udall
			Nowak	Valentine
			Oberstar	Vento
			Obey	Visclosky
			Olin	Volkmer
			Ortiz	Vucanovich
			Owens	Walgren
			Oxley	Watkins
			Packard	Waxman
			Panetta	Weaver
			Parris	Weiss
			Pashayan	Wheat
			Pease	Whitehurst
			Penny	Whitley
			Perkins	Whittaker
			Petri	Whitten
			Porter	Williams
			Price	Wilson

Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley

Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates

Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

NAYS—25

Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Cobey
Crane
Daub
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Eckert (NY)
Fields

Frenzel
Gekas
Hunter
Latta
Mack
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McMillan
Nielson

Saxton
Siljander
Smith (NH)
Swindall
Walker
Weber
Zschau

NOT VOTING—43

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
AuCoin
Barton
Beilenson
Boggs
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Chappell
Conyers
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Evans (IL)

Fish
Fowler
Fuqua
Gibbons
Hawkins
Hutto
LaFalce
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Livingston
McCurdy
Mineta
Mrazek
Nelson
O'Brien

Oakar
Pepper
Pickle
Rahall
Regula
Scheuer
Shaw
Smith (FL)
Stokes
Synar
Taylor
Vander Jagt
Wirth

□ 1210

Mr. COBEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1220

HANDICAPPED AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 285) designating the week of May 11, 1985, through May 17, 1985, as "Handicapped Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 285

Whereas the 1980's has been proclaimed by the Congress as the "Decade of Disabled Persons";

Whereas there are approximately 36,000,000 handicapped individuals in the United States;

Whereas the handicapped have proved that they can become useful members of society; and

Whereas the handicapped are patriotic citizens and deserve greater opportunities to become productive members of society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 11, 1985, through May 17, 1985, is designated as "Handicapped Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMILY REUNION MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 64) designating Mother's Day, May 12, 1985, to Father's Day, June 16, 1985 as "Family Reunion Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 64.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor of the House of Representatives today a resolution which I sponsored and strongly support.

Generally, I am very hesitant to lend my name to commemorative legislation. However, I felt that Family Reunion Month deserved special attention by myself and the entire Congress. I want to thank the 225 cosponsors who joined me in bringing this legislation to the floor and those who will support it now.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage the unity of our Nation's families. Too often we have the tendency to drift apart and the period between Mother's Day and Father's Day is a perfect time to urge people to be reunited.

However, this legislation has come to have a broader scope. In this time of national focus on the problems of missing children and the plight of their families, we must work toward

ending their uncertainty and suffering. Concrete steps were taken last year when this legislation first passed the House and Senate, and I am told many of these actions will be taken again this year.

Trailways Bus Lines offered free passes home to those who were runaways or estranged from their families and who wanted to return.

The TV movie, "Adam" was shown, graphically portraying to the American people the suffering and uncertainty faced by families with a missing member.

Private sector and charitable donations were made to facilitate the transfer of information from State, local, and private agencies to the then-proposed National Clearinghouse for Missing Children.

President Reagan had a bill signing ceremony for this legislation, which is rare for this type of resolution, because he knew that it would point to the concerns of families with missing loved ones.

Since Family Reunion Month 1984, we have seen a dramatic increase in the recognition by everyone that we must all work together to end the suffering of families with missing children.

Milk cartons and shopping bags bear the pictures and "last known facts" about those that are missing.

Several independent stations, such as WTBS-Turner Broadcasting, and cable networks have produced and broadcast programs detailing case histories and what families have done to search for their loved ones.

In my own district, Louise and John Clinckscates of LaGrange, GA, whose son, Kyle, has been missing for 9 years, have turned their sorrow into positive action which helps countless others. They wrote a book several years ago, "Kyle's Story; Friday Never Came," which details their search for their son who was leaving for college when he disappeared. This book is still considered to be one of the best discussions of the problems one will encounter while searching for missing loved ones.

The National Clearinghouse for Missing Children provides information access for searches which reach beyond a locale or State lines. This is particularly critical when foul play is suspected and every minute counts toward finding the loved one.

In conclusion, I would like to urge all my colleagues to support this measure on the floor and out in their districts because only through recognition of the problem can we work to correct it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 64

Whereas the family is and has traditionally been recognized as the foundation of our society;

Whereas thousands of families in our Nation experience sorrow each year because of runaway, missing, or estranged members;

Whereas organizations exist which can assist families and missing members in establishing contact with one another;

Whereas estranged and missing individuals should be encouraged to use the services furnished by these organizations or to contact their families directly;

Whereas the strength of our Nation can be increased through the reunion of families and the reaffirmation of family ties; and

Whereas Mother's Day and Father's Day are times when our citizens celebrate the importance of families; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating Mother's Day, May 12, 1985, to Father's Day, June 16, 1985, as "Family Reunion Month", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HIGH-TECH MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 128) designating the month of October 1985 as "National High-Tech Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 128

Whereas the economy of this Nation is closely tied to technological advances;

Whereas the United States has long been a leader in high technology development;

Whereas it is of the highest national interest to focus our collective abilities to maintain this leadership;

Whereas the national commitment to high technology development has been called into doubt;

Whereas the youth of the Nation need to have educational opportunities to grow and develop in a high technology environment; and

Whereas our youth should have a national focus on their high technology future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of October 1985 is designated as "National High-Tech Month". The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, including programs aimed at educating the Nation's youth about high technology.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARCIA

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARCIA: Page 2, line 6, strike out "week" and insert in lieu thereof "month."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERY SPECIAL ARTS U.S.A. MONTH

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 103) to designate the month of May 1985, as "Very Special Arts U.S.A. Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take one quick second on this last resolution and just state that Very Special Arts U.S.A. Month is really designated for those who are handicapped.

I have always maintained, Mr. Speaker, that the body may be handicapped, but the spirit is never handicapped.

I think this particular resolution is one that is very appropriate, because we must help and support those

people who are not as fortunate as others.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman's remarks and withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 103

Whereas programs involving the arts enhance the learning and enrich the lives of disabled individuals;

Whereas arts with the handicapped is a means of integrating disabled individuals into the mainstream of education and cultural society;

Whereas programs bringing arts to the handicapped inform the general public, parents, volunteers, and the business community of the value of arts to the disabled;

Whereas the emphasis is needed to expand support for arts programs with the handicapped and to increase participation and commitment of the community and educators to these activities;

Whereas the National Committee, Arts with the Handicapped, an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has successfully entered into its eleventh year as the coordinating agency for arts programs for disabled children, youth, and adults; and

Whereas the National Committee conducts education programs in all fifty States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to assure that all disabled individuals have access to programs which bring the arts into their lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of May 1985, is designated as "Very Special Arts U.S.A. Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to see the House consider House Joint Resolution 204 to designate May 1985 as Very Special Arts U.S.A. Month. This official designation recognizes the fine job of the National Committee, Arts with the Handicapped [NCAH] in providing opportunities for disabled children and adults to participate in art education programs.

NCAH, an educational affiliate of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, is our Nation's coordinating agency for arts programs for disabled people. With vibrant leadership, NCAH has pioneered the arts with the handicapped movement. The committee continues to develop innovative projects and through the events of their Very Special Arts Festival conducts a nationwide educational program unlike any other in the country.

The arts festival programs serve as a catalyst for the development of qual-

ity, ongoing programs integrating the arts into the education of disabled children in all 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. The impact of the arts in education is demonstrated in year-round programming and training for disabled and nondisabled children, educators, parents, and friends. These programs are instrumental in helping disabled students enter the mainstream of society.

Entering its 11th year, NCAH will change its name to Very Special Arts U.S.A. By proclaiming this May as Very Special Arts U.S.A. Month, we will herald in this important organization's second decade of service to more than 36 million Americans. I want to thank and commend all my colleagues who have joined me in supporting this resolution.●

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A FOND FAREWELL

(Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, this is a day I have always regretted that would come. I am going to miss all of you people very much.

I am glad that my friend, Joe Waggoner, is here today, a distinguished ex-Member of this House and a dear friend of mine.

I hope that the future for all of you people is as bright as it can be. I want to thank all of those who have been so kind to me over the past 9 years, those dear people who I am looking at now who have been so helpful, both Members and non-Members, and I hope that if you are ever in the east Texas area, that you will come visit with me. God bless all of you.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1872.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] as

chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1227

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1782) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with Mr. ECKART of Ohio (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST] will be recognized of 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, I present the bill, H.R. 1872, the Department of Defense Authorization Act, for fiscal year 1986.

The bill authorizes \$216.1 billion for all procurement, research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), operation and maintenance (O&M) for the Department of Defense and for civil defense for the fiscal year beginning next October 1. In addition, the bill authorizes the strength levels for both Active and Reserve military personnel and the civilian employees of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986. H.R. 1872 reflects cuts of \$14.3 billion from the President's request—an \$18.9 billion cut if the dollar implications of the committee's personnel actions are included.

The committee this year also included authorization of \$7.718 billion for the Department of Energy national security programs for a total authorization of \$223.8 billion.

DOLLAR AUTHORIZATIONS

By major categories, the authorization totals (exclusive of Department of Energy national security programs) recommended are as follows:

Procurement—\$99.4 billion;
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation—\$34.2 billion;
Operation and Maintenance—\$82.4 billion; and
Civil Defense—\$141 million.

Although the bill sets the numerical ceilings on personnel, it does not actually provide dollar authorizations in

the personnel accounts as it does for procurement, RDT&E, and O&M.

For the national defense function as a whole, \$302.6 billion would be provided for defense in fiscal year 1986 when all elements, including the military construction bill reported by the committee, are totaled.

REDUCTIONS

As reported by the committee, the \$18.9 billion cut in the President's budget request includes net reductions of \$7.3 billion in procurement; \$5.1 billion in RDT&E; \$1.9 billion in O&M; \$241 million in Department of Energy national security programs; and \$4.3 billion in the personnel area.

As you recall, the President's request would have provided nearly 6-percent real growth for fiscal year 1986. The committee felt that no real growth was a much more realistic level than the 6-percent real growth requested by the President. The bill the committee has reported, therefore, provides no real growth.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the committee took a somewhat new approach to its review of the budget this year. In approaching the necessary reductions, the Members decided the prudent course would be to take the bulk of the reductions in the investment accounts—procurement and R&D—rather than in the operating accounts—O&M and personnel.

In fact, over 65 percent of the committee's reductions are in the investment accounts. Thirty procurement programs were terminated. That is the largest number of procurement programs ever killed in the committee's history. These actions alone resulted in a cut of almost \$2 billion, and a real cut of more than 2 percent in weapons procurement.

In the areas that have received the most attention, the committee contains the following:

MX missile: An authorization of 21 missiles instead of the 48 requested by the administration—a reduction of \$1.1 billion. The committee defeated an amendment to cap deployment of the MX at 40 missiles by a rollcall vote of 13 to 32 and an amendment to delete all MX procurement money by a voice vote.

Chemical weapons: The committee approved the procurement request of \$124.5 million after defeating an amendment by voice vote to delete all funds for building binary weapons.

Strategic Defense Initiative: The committee approved funding of \$2.5 billion for SDI—a reduction of \$1.2 billion from the Administration request. Amendments were defeated that would have increased funding to \$3.1 billion and reduced funding to \$0.9 and \$1.4 billion.

Military retirement: The committee deleted \$4 billion from the funds requested for military pay and pensions

and directed the Defense Department to draft and submit a change to the retirement system that would apply only to those joining the military after the effective date of the change.

AMRAAM: The principal weapon system killed by the committee was the Joint Air Force/Navy Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM), which was designed as a follow-on missile to the Sparrow. The committee believes that projected costs have risen excessively, warranting termination. Although the Defense Department had requested authorization to buy the first 90 of the missiles in fiscal year 1986, AMRAAM would still require another half-billion dollars to complete R&D. The committee estimated that unit costs for the AMRAAM could end up at triple the original projected cost. Additionally, the program schedule has slipped by almost 2 years.

In all, the committee made changes to 266 programs in the procurement area and to 249 programs in R&D.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, I would like to address the personnel-related areas of H.R. 1872. We propose a substantial reallocation of benefits in H.R. 1872 made possible by inclusion of the direction to the Secretary of Defense to submit a proposal to change the military retirement system. The savings from this change permitted us to approve substantial benefit improvements for Active, Reserve, and retired members and their families.

Generally, the committee's major actions with respect to personnel fall into three categories.

First, we recommend placing a ceiling on the amount of money the Department of Defense has available to make required payments for the retirement program. We also direct the Secretary of Defense to develop—and to submit for congressional approval—a proposal for saving \$4 billion by changing the military nondisability retirement system for individuals who enter active duty after the date of the change. This can be accomplished because the Department of Defense currently sets aside each year, in a fund, enough money to pay for all future retirement benefits for the individuals who enter active duty in that year. Therefore, if a change to retirement benefits for individuals who enter active duty next year is enacted, less money needs to be set aside in the fund next year to pay for their future benefits. Consequently, the saving to the Defense budget is immediate.

Second, we propose modest changes to the President's requested increases in the number of personnel and pay. For active duty end strength, the committee reduced by 5,000 the requested increase of 15,000 for the Navy and reduced by 3,000 the requested increase

of 9,400 for the Air Force. For full-time support in the Selected Reserve, the committee cut 2,400 from the requested increase of 14,000 for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. In spite of the tight budget constraints facing us, the committee recommended that military personnel receive a 3-percent military pay raise next year that would be effective in January 1986.

Third, we propose a very substantial package of benefit improvements.

In the area of military families, the committee proposes approval of nearly every item requested (including improved travel and transportation benefits, improved medical benefits, and authorization of a cost-shared dental program for active duty dependents). We also recommend that the current dislocation allowance be increased.

In the area of retiree benefits, we propose improving the Survivor Benefit Plan and placing a \$3,000 cap on out-of-pocket expenses under CHAMPUS.

In the area of Active and Reserve incentives, the committee recommends approval of nearly all items in the President's request, as well as a number of enhancements that will assist in recruiting and retaining high quality personnel.

I should also point out that H.R. 1872 contains a number of provisions related to the Coast Guard which we included at the request of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I received a letter from Mr. JONES, the committee chairman, noting the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee's jurisdiction over these matters and waiving sequential referral. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be included in the RECORD.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1872 represents one step down the road we must travel to tighten up the military budget.

It demonstrates that we want more defense, not more production lines.

It demonstrates that we seek to fund military requirements, not bureaucratic wish lists.

It demonstrates that our hope for today and for the future is to provide fair compensation for all military personnel and their families through a reasonable pay and benefits program while they are in uniform rather than through an inefficient, costly retirement system that benefits only the 13 percent of the force that reaches retirement eligibility.

In short, H.R. 1872 represents prudent defense choices for fiscal year 1986. I urge my colleagues to approve this bill.

Mr. Chairman. I include the following letter:

COMMITTEE ON
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1985.
HON. LES ASPIN, Chairman,
Committee on Armed Services, 2120 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand your Committee proposes to include in the fiscal 1986 Defense Authorization Act language affecting the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The items involve operations of the United States Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and can be summarized as:

1. Change the name of the 0-7 flag grade in the naval services, which includes the Coast Guard and NOAA, from Commodore to Rear Admiral (lower half)—this includes changes to Title 14 (Coast Guard) and the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as well as conforming amendments in Title 10 and 37 which are under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

2. Amend the debt collection authority to apply to all of the uniformed services, which would therefore include NOAA, instead of just the Armed Services, as is now the case. In addition, a new authority to collect for dishonored checks has also been included.

3. Amend Section 660 of Title 14 to provide for a driver for the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

4. Amend Section 1588 of Title 10 to authorize the coast guard to accept voluntary services in support of museums or Family Support Programs.

These changes are noncontroversial. Our Committee agrees that including them in the Defense Authorization bill is the most expeditious way to accomplish them. Therefore, I do not intend to exercise our Committee's jurisdictional prerogative to request a sequential referral of the legislation. I do request a letter from you acknowledging our jurisdiction over these items and ask that copies of our correspondence be included in the Congressional Record as part of general debate on the bill.

With kind regards, I remain,
Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments in general about this year's Defense bill, as well as some particular comments concerning the operation and maintenance area contained in title III.

Let me begin by reemphasizing a point several of our colleagues have already alluded to concerning this year's Defense authorization bill. To characterize something as bare bones is becoming sort of shopworn these days. However, in my view that descriptive term really does apply to H.R. 1872. The bill before us is more than \$18 billion below the amount requested by the administration. It is almost \$30 billion below the level we in the Congress included in last year's budget resolution as an estimate of the fiscal year 1986 Defense requirement. This bill contains essentially no real growth

over last year's Defense levels. It is indeed a bare-bones Defense budget.

Less anyone misunderstand, let me hasten to say that I support the bill that our committee has reported. Like the majority of the members of our committee—both Republicans and Democrats—I feel very strongly about the need to maintain a vigorous National Defense Program. Individually we may disagree on particular issues, but we agree on that bottom line position of a strong defense.

I also recognize—again like the majority of our committee members—that there are many nondefense issues to be considered when deciding a level to recommend for the Pentagon's budget. I want to assure my fellow Members of this House that our committee most definitely kept nondefense factors in mind as we went through the long process of hearings and deliberations before crafting the bill under consideration today. I feel it is my responsibility to insure that you understand what we did and why I can say that our bill represents a bare-bones budget.

If you think my remarks tend to sound like those of an alarmist, you're right. I am alarmed. I'm alarmed about a number of things. For instance:

The continually increasing Soviet military threat.

The increasing requirements on our Defense Department to deal with that threat.

The growing cost of that Defense Program.

The decreasing share of national resources being devoted to that Defense Program.

The size of the Federal budget deficit to sustain that Defense Program, as well as all our vital and necessary domestic programs.

OK, so WHITEHURST is alarmed, you may say to yourself, so what, I am, too. My colleagues, I think all of us should be alarmed. We have some enormously important financial and budgetary decisions to make, decisions that are going to have a profound effect on every aspect of our society and our great Nation. We must make these decisions now before fiscal circumstances get any further beyond our control. As our committee chairman, Mr. ASPIN, the gentleman from Wisconsin, recently stated:

This budget is but one step down the road we must travel to tighten up the military budget.

I agree with our chairman and the majority of the members of our committee who voted to report the pending bill to your consideration. I believe it's a good bill and one that will not only help to maintain a strong national defense, but that will also allow a substantial defense contribution to reducing the deficit problem underlying the whole Federal budget.

I'd like to turn now to an area of the Defense budget that I consider to be very important—if not the most important. Title III of the bill contains the authorization details for operation and maintenance, as well as for the working capital funds. Another somewhat more descriptive and succinct name for this area is "readiness."

Perhaps some of my colleagues have heard references to a deliberate effort on the part of our committee to protect the O&M or readiness account. Let me put to rest any questions you may have in that regard. Yes, we are trying to protect readiness. I am very pleased to report to you that the decision to protect readiness was a clear and conscious one on the part of the committee. Without going into great detail concerning the myriad aspects of the readiness account, let me just say that it is up to all of us to be the guardians of readiness. The \$80.7 billion that the committee is recommending for operation and maintenance is a significant reduction from the administration's request of \$82.5 billion. It represents approximately 1 percent growth above inflation. And as pointed out in the detailed information in the report accompanying the committee's bill, this level of funding is the very minimum necessary to maintain military readiness.

The operation and maintenance readiness accounts are not very glamorous or sexy. There aren't the same kinds of pressures that we all know and understand in connection with the high visibility procurement and investment type accounts. Navy and Air Force flying hours, ship steaming days, Army and Marine battalion training days, maintenance of real property, and a whole host of other vital readiness items don't even begin to get the same kind of attention that one new class of ship, a flashy fighter plane, or a powerful new tank receives. But let me tell you, my colleagues, readiness items are the very heart of what makes our National Defense Program work.

I am not going to repeat all the various details of the information included in the explanatory language of the O&M portion of our report. Rather, let me urge you to read that information if you haven't already done so. Study it carefully. The overview and major policy issues sections in particular have information that is extremely important for every one of us to understand.

Our country has the best trained, best equipped, best supported, and brightest young men and women in the military services that we have ever had. The wide range of activities funded in the operation and maintenance account is fundamental to keeping readiness as good as it is and to improving it whenever possible. As I'm sure each of you knows, readiness is

the key to winning should we ever become involved in a conflict. But more importantly, readiness is also the key to effective deterrence.

In closing, I want to share two quotations with you. The first is by Winston Churchill, and I quote:

Politically ability is the ability to foretell what is going to happen tomorrow, next week, next month, and next year. And to have the ability afterwards to explain why it didn't happen.

The second quote is from Boris Marshalov who said:

Congress is so strange. A man gets up to speak and says nothing. Nobody listens—and then everybody disagrees.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can prove both Churchill and Marshalov wrong. I hope that we can plan and provide accurately and adequately for the future defense of our country. And, I hope that we don't find ourselves trying to explain why something different happened. So far as Marshalov is concerned, I hope each of us does listen and participate in the debate and discussion on this bill. And if we disagree on some points, so be it. But let's also make sure that the final outcome is a Defense authorization bill that will strengthen our National Defense Program and keep us the great nation we are.

My colleagues, I urge your support for H.R. 1872.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST] has consumed 8½ minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I take such time as I may require.

Members may be somewhat surprised that the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member are not controlling the time. Let me just point out that under the new leadership of our dynamic young chairman we have developed the kind of well-trained, experienced, and professional legislators that the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, was referring to a few minutes ago on the floor; so we junior members are taking over the load during this debate.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems, I wish to highlight some of the committee's major actions and recommendations concerning procurement that are included in title I and the general provisions in title X. Also, I will discuss the Department of Energy programs covered in title IX.

At the outset, I want to compliment the gentlelady from Maryland [Mrs. Holt], the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, for her leadership and cooperation. Also, I want to thank the other members of the subcommittee for their work and contribution.

Our task was not an easy one this year. Based on the guidance of the committee leadership, the committee marked to zero percent real growth. This level translated into an overall \$7.1 billion reduction in programs under the purview of the Procurement Subcommittee. This reduction meant that all of the real growth in procurement over fiscal year 1985, or \$5.2 billion, plus an additional \$1.2 billion would be cut in fiscal year 1986. As a result, procurement will have 2 percent negative real growth in fiscal year 1986.

To meet our objectives, we adopted a number of guidelines in order to make the necessary reductions.

First, reductions in programs would be made where fact of life changes occurred with production schedules, inventory adjustment, availability of prior year funds and contract savings;

Second, we would avoid decrementing logistics support, the spares base, and munitions programs to the extent possible and thereby protect readiness and sustainability;

Third, new procurements, particularly marginal programs, would be deferred where possible and increases in major programs would be constrained; as a consequence, 30 procurement programs are zeroed in H.R. 1872.

Fourth, at the same time, we would try to maintain steady production rates and move closer to buying out procurements, if possible; thus reducing the number of production lines;

Fifth, we would continue to support Guard and Reserve modernization efforts through either selected add-ons or earmarking of requested procurements;

Sixth, we would maintain committee initiatives, such as the Cooperative Airbase Defense Program for NATO; and

Seventh, finally, the respective service reductions would be based on their percent of real growth and budget share. As a result, the Air Force has absorbed the largest share of the reduction, or \$4.5 billion.

In the interest of time, I will simply highlight some of the major actions taken in each of the respective military departments.

ARMY

For the Army, the committee reduced the requested amount in aircraft procurement by \$216.4 million, primarily through contract savings and availability of prior year funds.

Following review of Army missiles, the committee agreed to:

Delete \$45 million for 530 Stinger air defense missiles;

Delete \$35 million for 5,100 TOW antitank missiles.

Under Army weapons and tracked combat vehicles, the committee recommends:

Deletion of \$196.5 million to reduce the Sergeant York air defense gun to 72 fire units.

The Committee recommends two major changes in Army other procurement as follows:

Deletion of \$50 million for 500 5-ton trucks; and

Deletion of \$68.9 million in the Aquila Remotely Piloted Vehicle Program.

For programs established solely for the motorized division, the committee recommends:

Deletion of \$10.5 million to terminate the Fast Attack Vehicle Program, and

Deletion of \$15 million in the Stinger Missile Program to defer the initiation of the Pedestal-Mounted Stinger Program.

NAVY

In the Navy, the committee took the following major actions:

Reduced the requested FA-18 advance procurement from 102 to 84 aircraft for savings of \$63.0 million;

Denied the request for 9-3C Orion ASW patrol aircraft for savings of \$493.4 million;

Denied the E-6A TACAMO request for a savings of \$400.2 million;

Deferred the VH-60 helicopter request by 1 year thus saving \$101.0 million; and

Reduced the aircraft modification line request by \$105.2 million.

AIR FORCE

In the Air Force, the committee took the following major actions:

Approved 21 of the 48 MX missiles requested for savings of \$1 billion;

Disapproved the requested \$438.8 million for the AMRAAM Missile Program;

Instituted an annual, ongoing competitive procurement program for the tactical fighter aircraft beginning in fiscal year 1986;

Maintained the production rate of F-15's at 42 aircraft instead of the requested 48 for savings of \$306.3 million;

Reduced the F-16 request from 180 aircraft to 150 for savings of \$642.7 million;

Deferred approval of the MC-130 Combat Talon aircraft because of cost growth, thus saving \$79.5 million; and

Approved the Air Force plan to terminate the Low Level Laser Bomb Program, for a reduction of \$103.7 million.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

Additionally, following up on the committee's concern about the national problem of poor communications security, the subcommittee added \$15 million for the National Security Agency to procure secure voice equipment.

DOD/NATO COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS

For DOD cooperative NATO programs, the subcommittee is recommending authorization of \$125.0 mil-

lion to continue the airbase defense initiatives in the Federal Republic of Germany and Turkey, and to initiate similar cooperative programs in Italy and Belgium.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

In terms of National Guard/Reserve initiatives, in addition to approving most of the requested items the committee is recommending the following items that total some \$730.4 million in authorization.

For the Army National Guard and Reserve forces: \$12.0 million for six C-12D aircraft; \$158.6 million for 18 of the requested 144 Apache attack helicopters; \$87 million for 36 Chaparral air defense fire units; \$30 million for 138 improved TOW vehicles; \$64.8 million for 12 of the recommended 72 Sergeant York air defense systems; and \$50 million for nonsystem training devices.

For the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve, the committee recommends the following: \$90.7 million for 5 A-6E aircraft for the first Naval Reserve medium attack capability and advance procurement for 11 aircraft in fiscal year 1987 to complete the reserve carrier air wing squadrons; \$23.0 million for four UH-60 sea rescue helicopters; \$40.0 million for two KC-130 tankers; and \$4.3 million for the Mobile Van Helicopter Kit Support Program.

For the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard: \$18 million for six C-12J aircraft; and \$150 million for eight C-130H airlift aircraft for the Air Force Reserves.

In addition, the committee is recommending the adoption of a legislative provision (section 1012) that is designed to implement a systematic approach for meeting the equipment shortfalls and requirements of the Guard and Reserve forces, particularly those units with early deployments or with critical missions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Other language initiatives, including the following items:

Authorization of six multiyear contract requests, provided at least 10 percent savings are realized; strengthening selected acquisition reports [SARS] on procurement by requiring life cycle cost estimates on new acquisition programs;

Requiring compliance with testing standards and performance guarantees of the Sergeant York [Divad] system before obligation of any funds is permitted;

Directing 20,000 miles of testing of competitive truck/engine combinations prior to award of a new contract for the 5-ton truck; and authorization of a 5-year multiyear contract, provided at least 10 percent savings are realized;

Establishing a no cost warranty for the wing of the A-6E aircraft that

guarantees at least 4,000 flying hours; and

Directing that F-14 aircraft procured in fiscal year 1986 be configured so as to incorporate the F-110 engine.

Mr. Chairman, I will turn now to the Department of Energy defense authorization programs.

□ 1250

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Committee on Armed Services now for the past 9 years, and I enjoy the service on that committee, because I think it is a committee that is not only well represented throughout this country, but we have a staff that is superb, and the committee works hard, and I find the work at the same time interesting and yet frustrating.

It is a pleasure to serve on that committee, recognizing the responsibility that this committee has, not only to the House, but to the people of this country.

There I find some frustrations and some fears that I would express to you and the membership today. I fear that we are in an era where the perception of the need for national defense of this country is somehow waning among some Members of this body, and the people we represent, while we carry out our responsibility as sworn to uphold the Constitution and provide for the common defense.

I fear for that because we are in an era where we are suffering from what I refer to as overclassification, and the fallout from that. By overclassification, I mean that the members of the House Armed Services Committee and members of other committees; Intelligence being one, Foreign Affairs being another, are constantly made aware by our intelligence community of the status of forces in the world, and what we understand and what we are given to see, we do not appreciate, and we of necessity therefore must try to convey to the people and to the others Members of this body and the other body, the necessity of preserving a strong defense.

We are in some regards losing that battle because the perception of the true threat as it does exist simply is not getting across to the American people, and this is because, and I lament this, that the people of the United States, by our system of overclassification, are denied the proper information that they should have on what is really going on in this world military, particularly with our potential adversary, the Soviet Union.

This I think is unfortunate, and it is extremely important because it lulls not only Members of Congress who do not avail themselves of the classified

briefings that are available, but the people of this country themselves, into thinking there really is not that big a threat, so why do we need to spend all this money for defense.

That brings us to the bill at hand. It is a good bill; I intend to support it; it is as good a bill as the efforts of our staff and our membership on the committee have been able to put together in the time allotted and with the political exigencies of the day as they exist.

We nevertheless do have before us a bill, and I have some fears about this bill and the future that it will project. Since the late 1970's and 1980, we have increased the pay and the well-being of our people in the uniformed service of our country; we have increased the amount of training each and every individual receives; we have increased flying hours; we have increased steaming days; we have increased the procurements, and yet we have spent strangely, surprisingly little additional money compared to the outlays of the previous administration.

For an example, in fiscal year 1985, the outlays for our defense, even though we have the increases in morale and benefits and procurement and readiness and steaming and flying, we spent \$24 billion less than was projected by the previous administration back in 1981.

How were we able to do this? Partially we were able to do this by better controls, better purchasing habits, better business-like operation despite the criticism that the Pentagon has received, from ferreting out some of the waste, fraud, and abuse; we have actually gotten more bang for less than the projected buck of the previous administration.

Why does this, therefore, cause me fear? The fear that I have is that we are falling now by necessity, political necessity, into the same pattern that we had during the late 1970's. If we cannot afford to buy something in an efficient manner today, we do not buy it; we do not field it; this and that, but what actually happens, we stretch it out.

From the late 1970's, we know that when you start stretching out programs, you are not buying efficiently. When we stretch out these buys, we buy less efficiently, and the price goes up and the program is strung out, and all the pertinent efficiencies are taken away.

We are going to be strong in fiscal year 1986. We are strong in fiscal year 1985, but the future is ganging up on us again, and we are going into another dip necessitated by the political exigencies of the day.

We have had to discontinue some, and we have had to not fund other multiyear procurements, as the chairman of our Subcommittee on Procurement has said, because we cannot afford the 1986 fiscal year dollar. This

is dangerous, and this bodes ill for us and for our relationship with our allies.

That is the bad news that I see in the future, but as far as this bill is concerned, it is a good bill, and it is the best we have been able to do.

I would like to say that with what we have been able to do for our personnel, which is one of our largest military costs, and larger per capita than probably any other country in the world, our instances of unauthorized absence and desertion are way, way down; our reenlistment rates are up; our training is up; our quality of personnel is up. We will have to keep this up, and this will only be done by future expenditures in a meaningful way.

We are in a place now where our personnel costs are pretty much set; our procurements are pretty much established by contracts made during previous years; our creature comforts for the well-being of our personnel are pretty much dictated and in the budget, and so the only place we can cut is by stretching our programs; making each item for our defense cost more and by taking out of readiness, taking it out of training and the intangibles.

I caution this body against this; I will support this, and I hope we will have a return to a more popular and supported defense in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

□ 1300

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak in general debate on the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1986, I choose to make three points.

First, I would like to inform the body that at the appropriate time I will be offering a substitute to the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1986 on behalf of myself, members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members of this body who view the world in different terms than this administration and the majority of the Members of the Armed Services Committee and have a very different version of the nature of the problems in the world and the nature of our role in this world.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to also indicate that at the appropriate point during the markup of the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1986 I will be offering an amendment to limit the funding for the so-called strategic defense initiative, or more euphemistically re-

ferred to as the star wars program. What we would do in this proposal, Mr. Chairman, is to limit the funding to basic research. We have communicated with members of the organization known as the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Federation of American Scientists, who tell us that there is need for some basic research in order to not allow a breakout on the part of the Soviet Union or at least that we understand what is going on in the area. But what we would not allow to go forward in the category of basic research is any basic research that would move us toward the development of a nuclear weapon to be stationed in space. We oppose that and we would prohibit it by zeroing out that category.

Second, Mr. Chairman, we would also exclude from the category of basic research that research designed to develop an energy conversion mechanism in space. Simply stated, we opposed nuclear powerplants on Earth. We do not want to see nuclear powerplants in space. But we would allow, with those two major and, in my estimation, significantly important exceptions, basic research to go forward.

We would, under our proposal, prohibit any demonstration projects, any major experiments that we believe would move us toward violation of our ABM Treaty and would result in a major escalation of our antisatellite arms race which I perceive to be extremely dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, the third point that I would like to make is a few comments on the bill before us, the authorization bill approved by the Committee on Armed Services.

This year, Mr. Chairman, the committee has brought forward an authorization bill which freezes new authority at last year's level in real terms adjusted for inflation.

Now, while this is an important improvement over previous years, let me remind my colleagues that this zero percent real growth continues massive defense spending buildup. It does not reduce it at all. I repeat, for the purposes of emphasis: It does not reduce it at all. The only reductions are for hoped for increases. They asked for major increases. All we did was reduce the hoped for increases. We have not reduced real spending.

This bill, indeed, increases authorization by some 4 to 5 percent over last year's level.

Now, what most Members do not seem to understand, Mr. Chairman, is that the defense spending that contributes to the deficit in not only this new authorization but the authorization from prior years—and this is terribly important—that is being spent this year. In the language of the budget, we call these outlays.

For example, the committee is authorizing a figure of \$99.4 billion for

all procurement for fiscal year 1986. Actual spending for procurement in fiscal year 1986 will be approximately \$82 billion. However, all but \$10 billion of that \$82 billion will be for prior year authorization, Mr. Chairman.

Now, stated a different way, even if we zeroed out this category, even if we brought a bill to the floor of Congress and said in procurement 1986 we would zero out all authorization, you would still have to place \$72 billion in that procurement category; \$72 billion, even if you zeroed it out. And I do not think many Members clearly understand that what has been done here is to front load this military budget with an incredible escalation that will have impact over a variety of years. It is almost bizarre, when one considers that we could zero out this category and only \$10 billion of the \$82 billion we will actually spend for fiscal year 1986 will be for new authorization; the other \$72 billion, because what was done in fiscal year 1985, 1984, 1983, 1982, 1981, et cetera.

The point is that spending figures will continue rapidly upward for the rest of this decade even if we have real growth freezes during that time. It still escalates even if you have a freeze. So this notion of a freeze is no magic. It does not engage in saving us tremendous amounts of money because even if you freeze it, this military budget will escalate.

Mr. Chairman, even if we freeze without any real growth—and hear me out—without any real growth, as recommended by our Budget Committee—we heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] point that out in the last couple of days—the spending will continue to increase rapidly. Actual spending for the present fiscal year 1985 will be about \$250 billion. Even if we freeze for this next year, the year after that and the year after that, Mr. Chairman, actual spending outlays will still be over \$300 billion in fiscal year 1988. This is an increase of over \$50 billion in 3 years, even with the freeze.

Under the President's budget, this figure would be about \$350 billion, \$350 billion by 1988, an increase of \$100 billion.

Now, all this data that I am laying out to you is data that we derived from the House Budget Committee in February of this year.

Mr. Chairman, we must begin to seriously begin to reduce what we are now authorizing before our economy is completely consumed by the military budget.

Mr. Chairman, now that I have laid that out, the reason why we choose to offer a substitute at the appropriate time is that we believe that it is important to not make reductions arbitrarily. Rather, we must rethink our policies so that they are coherent and ra-

tional and reflect the best interests of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the real growth issue before us is not whether it is zero percent growth or any other figure. The real issue is what is the proper national security policy and what are the requirements for the defense of our country. This should be the main focus of the debate. But, Mr. Chairman, as you and I very well know, unfortunately in the past, little debate of this kind has taken place on the floor of this House on policy matters. The administration's view and the moneys being authorized in this bill, which basically support the administration's view, are not correct assessments of our national security requirements as this gentleman assesses them. The national security role of the United States should be to assert international leadership necessary to bring the world closer to peace, Mr. Chairman. Military tensions must be eased, détente must be revived, and the threat of nuclear war must be removed from our lives. The only real use of nuclear weaponry is to prevent war and to prevent the use of such heinous and devastating weapons. Our focus should be deterring war and spending billions of dollars to arm ourselves to fight tactical nuclear wars around the globe or to build vast strategic weaponry whose only function would be to make nuclear devastation even more devastating, nor need we spend additional tens of billions of dollars to prepare for a protracted, so-called, conventional land war in Europe with the Soviet Union.

□ 1310

Mr. Chairman, we need to fundamentally reassess our defense policies, and determine whether alternatives may make more sense than those proposed by the administration or my respected and distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee.

The alternative vision we would offer in our substitute in pursuit of such a fundamental discussion of basic Armed Services Committee policy, is based on our assessment of what would be a proper defense strategy for this Nation. I will discuss these issues at length at the appropriate time. So for the moment, let me simply outline the major themes of the proposal.

First, to lessen the threat of nuclear war through support of a nuclear freeze, and for arms control initiatives which would lead to prompt reductions in major weapons systems.

Second, a noninterventionist, national security policy.

Third, a reduced U.S. role in Europe and in Asia.

Fourth, a redirection of procurement policies to reduce waste, fraud, abuse, and massive cost overruns.

And fifth, a stronger national security through a policy of conversion to an

economy less dependent upon military spending.

Mr. Chairman, while substantial reductions are made from the administration's proposal, it should be noted that even with these large cuts that this gentleman would propose, spending under this proposal will still continue at recent levels.

For example, in fiscal 1986, spending will still be more, unfortunately, more than \$9 billion above the spending levels of fiscal year 1985 Defense appropriations, and will constitute a real growth of 39 percent; over 8.5 percent per year since fiscal 1980.

In large measure, Mr. Chairman, this is due to the lengthy spendout period of the major procurement increases approved over the past years that I alluded to earlier in my presentation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in addition to making our defense more secure, implementation of these themes that I have alluded to earlier would result in authorization savings of some \$286 billion over the next 3 years. These savings are sufficient both to reduce significantly the unprecedented budget deficits that we are confronted with, and make resources available for selected increases in desperately needed social programs to address the human misery of our people in this Nation.

I thank the Chair and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his generosity.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1872, the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense authorization bill, and will address primarily those aspects of the bill that deal with sea-power and naval shipbuilding.

Mr. Chairman, I have often heard it said that the primary reason for the existence of a Federal Government or a central government is to do those things for its people that they cannot do for themselves, either as individuals or as States or units of government.

The main thing that people cannot do themselves and that the States cannot do for their people, is to protect them from foreign aggression. In recent years, we have seen this country's military decline to a point that was a fearsome thing for many people who are concerned about our defense.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago, President Reagan set a course for a naval recovery program for this Nation, a program designed to restore this country's waning maritime superiority. Our naval recovery program is working, in spite of some ups and downs in the annual budgetary battles. We have seen a dramatic increase in the quality, training, and morale of our naval personnel; a substantial improvement

in the readiness of our forces, and in their ability to sustain themselves in combat; and a growing number of high-quality ships entering the fleet as we move towards our goal of the "600-ship Navy."

The cornerstone of our efforts to rebuild the Navy is a clear statement of a realistic, effective maritime strategy for the employment of naval forces both in peacetime and, if need be, in time of conflict. Simple in concept, but more complex in its execution, this maritime strategy is made up of two main tasks. Described before our committee earlier this year by Navy Secretary John Lehman, those tasks are: First, to prevent the seas from becoming a hostile medium of attack against the United States and its allies; and second, to ensure that we have unimpeded use of the ocean lifelines to our allies, our forward deployed forces in peace and war, our energy and mineral resources, and our trading partners; to be able to project force from the seas in support of our national security objectives short of war; and to be able to bring force to bear directly in support of combat ashore should deterrence fail.

Translating this maritime strategy into the day-to-day workings of the Navy is a somewhat more difficult job. Our Navy is deployed around the world every day of the year in support of our national goals and commitments.

Adm. James Watkins, the Chief of Naval Operations, aptly describes the world in which we live as being in a state of "violent peace." The United States is at peace with its neighbors, but armed actions and mounting tensions are a fact of daily life.

Our naval forces would likely be caught up in the early stages of any conflict involving the United States and which could possibly erupt from the 30 conflicts currently underway in various parts of the globe. Admiral Watkins summarized this situation very well when he said, "Naval forces must be prepared to encounter high technology, combined arms threats in virtually every ocean of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Navy program contained in the bill before us today will go a long way toward the effective implementation of our maritime strategy. It has the numbers and quality of ships needed to maintain the forward deployment and flexibility that are characteristic of the Navy's contribution to deterrence. The 23 new construction ships and 5 conversions recommended by the committee are a balanced, prudent request in light of the fiscal restraints we face in this year's defense budget. Let me briefly touch upon a few of the major types of ships in this year's bill.

AEGIS CRUISER

The Aegis guided missile cruisers of the Ticonderoga class recommended in

the committee bill are truly the state of the art in anti-air warfare protection for our carrier battle groups. Less expensive by over \$200 million than the three ships authorized last year, these three ships—with their sophisticated but highly reliable radars—will be capable of effectively countering the numbers and sophistication of the Soviet AAW threat well into the future. In fact, 1984 was a banner year for the Aegis system and the first ship of the class, the U.S.S. *Ticonderoga*. She was at sea over 80 percent of the time during her initial 6-month deployment to the North Atlantic and the Mediterranean, a deployment that began on much shorter notice than usually given a new ship. During this cruise, she operated with two carrier battle groups, conducting over 2,500 intercepts with their aircraft and maintaining an overview of the air activity over the entire eastern Mediterranean of unprecedented quality, for any type of ship, ever. Following this highly successful cruise, she returned to the Caribbean weapons test range where she downed 10 of 11 target drones simulating multiple missile attacks in a highly stressing operational test. As Admiral Watkins summarized the ship's performance after her cruise and test firings, "Aegis *** is the best anti-air warfare system the Navy has ever had."

LOS ANGELES CLASS ATTACK SUBMARINES

The four Los Angeles class SSN-688 attack submarines in the committee bill are a vital step in reaching the Navy's force goal of 100 nuclear attack submarines by 1990. The Soviet Union continues to outbuild us in nuclear submarines at the rate of 3 to 1; they are also getting better at incorporating the technologies that have traditionally given the United States an edge in submarine warfare. The ships in this year's bill will do three things to redress this situation: First, they will help to make up for the dangerously low attack submarine building rate of the late 1970's; second, they will incorporate a series of modifications to the earlier 688 class design that will make them the world's quietest nuclear submarines, capable of performing multiple missions in a superb manner; and third, they will provide an orderly transition in both numbers and technology to the next generation of attack submarine, the SSN-21.

LHD-1 MULTIPURPOSE AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP

The committee bill would also authorize funds for the second of the WASP class multipurpose amphibious assault ships so essential in providing adequate mobility for our Marine Corps forces. The LHD-1 is impressive in its capabilities to move men and equipment: nearly 2,000 troops, 23,000 square feet of vehicles, 109,000 cubic feet of cargo, 400,000 gallons of fuel,

three air cushion landing craft, and 42 CH-46 helicopters, can be delivered by this ship on short notice anywhere in the world. The LHD is also capable of acting as a minicarrier in a sea-control mission, handling up to 6 LAMPS Mark III antisubmarine warfare helicopters and 20 AV-8B short/vertical-takeoff jet aircraft. The committee bill would authorize the Navy to buy the next three of these vitally needed ships on a multiyear basis, thus saving money and adding these ships to the fleet sooner.

Multiyear procurement of ships is but one of the ways the Navy is saving money in the shipbuilding program. Increased competition among multiple sources in the shipbuilding budget—used in just 16 percent of ship procurements in 1980, but used in over 84 percent this year—has done much to lower the cost of our ships. This year, the committee was able to take advantage of nearly one-half billion dollars in such savings achieved in the 1981-1984 shipbuilding budgets; with continued prudent management by the Navy, and increased competition, we hope to achieve more savings in the future. I would also point out that Navy shipbuilding and repair work accounts for over 80 percent of all employment in that industry in the United States today.

Let me add one final word about the threat posed by the Soviet Navy. As President Reagan has pointed out, we, in this country don't have the luxury of formulating our defense budget in a vacuum; we must constantly be aware of Soviet activities and programs that seek to undermine our ability to meet our national objectives in the use of the world's oceans. The Soviets work hard at denying us those objectives. During the past year, for example, they continued to maintain about 2,400 ships and craft in their inventory, including nearly 300 major surface combatants and 380 submarines. They were building, or fitting out, six classes of major surface combatants and seven classes of submarines in 1984. The Soviet Navy now operates on a worldwide scale, increasing the number of ship-days spent out of home waters every year. In short, we face a formidable foe, one apparently willing to spend heavily on its Navy in an attempt to gain leverage over the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we must regain the maritime superiority this Nation needs for its survival. Although modest in size, the recommendation before us today will do much to help reach that goal. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

□ 1320

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a brief colloquy?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I served in the military as an infantry commander, so I am not briefed totally on the development of our naval program of 600 ships, but I did read Secretary Lehman's full report when he testified before the Senate outlining the long-term goals of the Navy.

I happen to personally support that. I have, in the appropriations process and debate here with amendments over the years. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he is confident that within our existing appropriation authorized levels this year and past years that we are getting not only the ships themselves, but the training on those ships and the additional equipment necessary so that our mission around the world is met adequately in terms of meeting the goals of national security?

Does the gentleman feel that the Navy is sort of recovering and coming back to a proper level of funding under our existing budget?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, I do. As a matter of fact, I said earlier we had slipped dangerously low, I think, in our commitments throughout the world because of our lack of ships and training and personnel and all the rest, up until about 1980.

Under the new programs we have instituted since that time, we have begun construction on many ships. We have taken possession of others. Our training is in a better state right now, and I think we are better able to meet our commitments throughout the world and the objectives therein.

Mr. PURSELL. Secretary Lehman also indicated in his testimony—and I recommend its reading to every Member of the House—that the morale of the troops is up, that the training and recruitment is up in respect to higher high school graduates, and the percentage has increased dramatically in which there are better trained seamen than before.

I am confident that maybe we have moved to that higher standard of vigilance and training on behalf of our national security and have met that level of responsibility that I think we have committed ourselves to the last few years.

Financially and budgetwise, I do not know if we are at the right level, maintaining the existing appropriation and authorization. I think that should be fully debated within the context of this committee and the Committee on Appropriations in respect to the naval budget. I think that has not been fully debated in public in terms of the strategy and mission but I am confident we have made some big gains over the last few years. I agree with the gentleman in the well.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us the fiscal year 1986 defense budget. This has come about as a result of many, many days and hours of hearings in the subcommittee and committee in the Committee on Armed Services, and I wish to take this opportunity to commend the chairman for his leadership, to the members for the tireless work they have put in, and the staff, the finest staff, I think, in this area in the world. I compliment them for the work that they have done.

This is a very responsible piece of work that has been brought, and it is as a result of compromises, as a result of amendments both defeated and passed, but it is one that we can all be proud of as a final product. It is one where \$18.9 billion has been cut from the President's request and some 30 procurement programs have been terminated. On the other hand, it is a very strong national defense proposal, one that is responsible to our Nation as a proper defense for the days and years ahead, and also responsible to the people of our country for doing the best that we can to maintain a fiscally respectable position.

I would like to comment first on an item that was mentioned by the gentleman from California a few moments ago, and that was regarding the policy decisions in the Committee on Armed Services.

I think that we are seeing for the first time long-range policy decisions and determination being made, rather than counting beans or tanks or airplanes or bullets. In addition to that very difficult and arduous task, we are looking down the road as to what our defense needs must be, what our commitments are, and where we are going as a nation. I think that for the first time we have recognized the long-range necessity and we are doing that, as a result, not just in our subcommittee and committee work, but in the policy panel that our chairman has established and I think that this is a step in the right direction and you will see better decisions in the long run as a result of this work.

This defense bill has, as many know, cuts that are too much for some and not enough for others. We have a problem with the \$200-plus billion deficits in our Nation, but everyone has to pay his or her fair share, and also there is a perception on the part of the American public that fairness is what we need, and that is why I say this is a responsible work, one where we did take the cuts but in a manner which does not lessen our deterrent capability, but one that keeps us strong.

In reshaping this budget, I think one of the most important things that we did was to continue to strengthen the Reserve Forces of our Nation. The Reserves of all of our forces, plus the National Guard have benefited from substantial add-ons; to name a few, the Chaparral air defense missile system, the UH-60 utility helicopters, the C-130 transport aircraft, and many others.

Unfortunately, through the years, as a result of the nature of the animal, there has been a bias in the Pentagon that seems to neglect the Reserve Forces in favor of the Active Forces, but today, in today's military situation, we see that many of our units that could be deployed in combat come from our Reserve Forces, the Reserves and the National Guard. As a result, we in our committee have added some emphasis on those Reserve Forces, which has been needed for quite some time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a leaner defense; it is a better defense. It is one that has been a collective effort on our committee and it is one that deserves the support of the Members of this body.

In every bill there is an issue or two of controversy, and there is one that is of controversial nature that I wish to mention that is so clear to me that were we to omit it from this bill that it would be, in the terms of one of our distinguished retired military leaders, criminal negligence, and that is the inclusive within this bill of the need to have a proper deterrent capability in the area of chemical warfare. It is controversial, it is not pleasant to talk about, it is one that would be easier to shove behind us, but it is one that we must face and this is the year that we must face it directly.

We know what the Soviet capability is regarding chemicals. We know the research and development that they have been involved with.

We also know that they have the ability in their Warsaw Pact forces and among their army in Eastern Europe to use these measures to the detriment of the Western World.

One of the most controversial measures is the inclusion of this in our bill but it is terribly important. We had a special hearing on this issue, and I am convinced and driven irresistibly to the conclusion that we must have a proper deterrent of offensive chemical weaponry, for not to do so would be to invite disaster. It would also be to lower the nuclear threshold and make the use of nuclear weapons much more likely should there be a conflict.

First, let me say that the report of the Presidential Commission, which included the very fine gentleman who just retired recently, Barber Conable,

favors the production of this type of system.

Second, we have a new way of producing this type of weaponry in a safe manner, which is in what we call a binary type of weaponry where the two ingredients are not mixed together. They are not used together until they are fully deployed.

We all know, third, that defensive measures are not enough, that we would be at a disadvantage if we only take defensive measures, and we need a deterrent measure in the area of chemical warfare.

For this reason I very strongly urge that what we have in the bill remain there, and I hope we can convince others of this wisdom because not to do so would be certainly wrong and a disservice to those who wear the uniform.

Mr. Chairman, the most important part of our national defense is the men and women who wear the uniform, the people of our armed services. In passing this bill, we will have taken care of them, and in so doing we hope to encourage them to continue the fine careers that so many of them have started. We have included a 3-percent pay raise. We need to take care of those people who do the tough, the dirty, and the difficult jobs of defending our interests in this world.

We have also allowed an increase in the permanent change-of-stations allowance. Some of these people are taking money out of their own pockets when they are transferred from place to place.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this bill to the Members of this body and urge its passage. It is a lean bill. It is a responsible bill. It is a bill that will keep us with a high deterrence in this very dangerous world in which we live.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems, I would like to say a few words about the subcommittee's action on H.R. 1872.

As the chairman stated, the subcommittee reduced the procurement request by \$6.7 billion, a 7-percent cut in the request.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York, did a superb job in making these tough decisions, and I would like to second the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri. We do have an outstanding staff on this committee, and they did a wonderful job in supporting us in our efforts to try to make these reductions.

Mr. Chairman, this leaves the procurement account—less shipbuilding—with a real decrease of about 2 percent over the appropriation of fiscal year 1985.

This severe cut was made necessary in part by the full committee's decision to support a reasonable rate of

growth in the operations and maintenance account. This is the second year the committee has agreed to protect the O&M account which has been subject to severe cuts in the past.

We made some tough decisions in the procurement subcommittee which were upheld in full committee. We deleted the total procurement request of \$438.8 million for the advanced medium-range air-to-air missile [AMRAAM]. We did this after the committee had learned that the projected unit cost of this system had tripled, and the schedule for the program had slipped by almost 2 years.

We eliminated all funding for the E-6A Navy aircraft. This committee believes that in this tough budget climate it would be inappropriate to start a program of this magnitude. Additionally, we directed DOD to restructure the development schedule to comply with the law. The program as proposed was much too concurrent with little or no development preceding production.

Recognizing the contribution of the National Guard on Reserve forces, the committee added more than \$700 million for new equipment for those components.

With respect to the current deficit problem, I recognize the need for defense to contribute a fair share toward reducing the deficit, but I have great concern about cutting the rate of improvement of our national defense force structure. This administration has made great strides in repairing the damage to our defense capability caused by years of fiscal neglect.

We have come a long way. Recruitment and retention are up. First quarter 1985 reenlistments rates are up 11 percent since 1980.

In the areas of readiness our pilots are getting 30 percent more flying time than they were in 1980 and aircraft ready rates have improved 7 percent in that time. Munitions inventories have increased by an average of 39 percent across all four services. We are fielding more and better items of equipment to our combat ready forces.

I am greatly concerned that the cuts over and above what we have in this bill could turn this remarkable improvement around and could send us back to the bleak days of the 1970's and early 1980's.

The President's defense request would have required about 6.4 percent of the gross national product. I don't think this is an unreasonable level for the leader of the free world to devote to its national defense.

Let me quote what Alice Rivlin, the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office, told this committee 2 years ago on February 16, 1983:

Clearly the U.S. economy can support the defense buildup proposed by the administration. Under that buildup defense in 1988

would take about 7.7 percent of GNP, similar to the level in the early 1970's.

While the cuts we are describing today were painful to most of us and resulted in the loss of real capabilities, further cuts of the magnitude suggested by some Members would be absolutely devastating to readiness, sustainability, and modernization. We would most certainly have to cut deeply into O&M—which this committee has protected over the last 2 years. These cuts would abort the improvements in defense that Members of Congress have fought so hard to obtain.

I urge Members to oppose any further cuts in the defense account beyond those that are in our bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, title II of H.R. 1872, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, provides authorization of \$34.1 billion for the fiscal year 1986 Research, Development, Test and Evaluation [RDT&E] Program.

The Department of Defense requested \$39.2 billion for fiscal year 1986. The committee's action results in a reduction of \$5.1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the research, development, test and evaluation account has grown by 100 percent in less than 4 years. While some of this growth was absolutely essential, the committee believed that the Pentagon placed too much emphasis on developing new systems rather than on advancing the state of technology. There can be no question that if the committee were to approve every weapon system on the Pentagon agenda, we would have serious affordability problems in the post-1990 period. We simply cannot do it all and accordingly, the committee terminated many programs—52—in all.

I would emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that the committee paid strict attention to fulfilling military requirements to the maximum practical extent. We did it by providing fewer systems. For example, we are asking the Pentagon to choose between a Navy version of a data system called the Joint Tactical Information Distribution System—JTIDS—and the Air Force version. There is no good reason, during this period of austerity, for the services to have both systems. One will do the job very well.

We terminated the Joint Surveillance Targeting and Attack Radar System—JSTARS—but we provided a less costly alternative to do the job.

Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about the size of the Federal deficit. Defense must contribute its fair share toward the reduction of this deficit. The contribution must not, however, jeopardize our national security. The budget for the RDT&E function as recommended by the committee is a

responsive and a responsible authorization, fulfills the greatest majority of all military requirements, does not jeopardize in any way our national security objectives, provides for the revitalization of our science and technology program in American universities, and streamlines the Pentagon's weapons development process.

Mr. Chairman, title II of H.R. 1872 contains a very significant addition—\$175 million for university research. I would like to explain to the members why this is vital given the fact that we had to make sizable reductions in other defense accounts.

The purpose of this university research initiative is to maintain an adequate science and technology base essential to our national security objectives. The maintenance of an adequate technology base within the universities throughout the country is the responsibility of all Federal agencies including the Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation.

The committee is concerned that the enrollment of U.S. university graduate schools in critical areas consists principally of foreign nationals. U.S. industrial salaries offered to scientists, engineers, and others in critical skills are so attractive that little incentive exists for those with bachelor degrees to continue in graduate education. The U.S. university base has been on the decline; university facilities and instrumentation are in many instances antiquated; graduate students are not exposed to many high technology areas until they begin their industrial careers; and the exchange of innovative ideas between the universities and the Federal laboratories has declined.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense must contribute its fair share toward preserving our industrial base and ensuring a future talent pool from which to draw. Accordingly, the committee recommended an addition of \$175 million to the Department's request for \$25 million to begin the university research initiative. This recommendation has been strongly supported by the President's Science Adviser, the American Association of Universities, and representatives from the Department of Defense. The committee intends that the authorization be used as follows:

To extend the research fellowship program for U.S. students to encourage graduate study;

To modernize university laboratories and instrumentation;

To infuse as early as possible high technology programs such as tunable free electronic lasers for medical application, very high speed integrated circuit technology and other areas that a graduate student would not normally encounter until he or she entered industry; and

To establish a greater exchange of ideas and to enhance the working rela-

tionship between Federal research centers and laboratories and the universities.

The committee was advised by the President's Science Adviser that the recommended level of authorization is essential and that it was to be included in the Department of Defense fiscal year 1986 budget request but was inadvertently deleted during the budget process. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will request the appropriate level of authorization for fiscal year 1987.

I ask your support and that of my colleagues for title II of H.R. 1872 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

□ 1340

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, today we consider the authorization of funds for the Defense Foundation, it is unfortunate that we are operating under artificial budgetary constraints, rather than proposing the authorization of levels of manpower, equipment and research, which are truly equal to the threat posed by our adversaries in the world, which should be the proper measure of our Nation's security needs. What we have authorized under these fiscal constraints are bare-bone measures which do not fully meet the range of likely threats and are at best marginally capable of defending our Nation, honoring our commitments to our allies and, most importantly, deterring aggression.

In my view, the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense authorization bill which has frozen defense spending at fiscal year 1985 plus inflation levels is the minimum that prudence will support. To do less places us at an unacceptable risk in a very uncertain world. We have seen no evidence of diminishing Soviet buildup of strategic nuclear or conventional weapons. They continue notwithstanding their lead to develop new weapons at an undiminishing pace. They have devoted immense resources to developing strategic defense systems; yet they insist that the United States should not. They would have themselves defended and have us leave ourselves undefended from their massive strategic nuclear first-strike capability.

This Department of Defense authorization bill has reduced our efforts in this strategic defense response, and I regard that as certainly undesirable.

As we weigh our defensive needs against the necessities of reducing spending levels and shrinking the level of deficits, we should be aware that for every \$1 billion spent for defense, there are 35,000 jobs created.

Now, I certainly would not advocate that we spend money for defense un-

necessarily as a jobs program, but it is not without significance that money spent for the defensive needs of the country do, in fact, have positive economic benefits. They reduce the negatives on the public purse by diminished unemployment compensation and other social benefits that are necessary through unemployment. They increase the revenues to the Treasury, making it possible for the Nation to try to meet its minimal needs.

So certainly dollars spent for legitimate defense needs are in a different category from dollars spent for programs and activities that have no positive economic implications for the total economy.

Before concluding, let me assume of my colleagues have done address the critical necessity for this Nation to develop a viable chemical warfare deterrent. This Nation has produced no chemical weapon now for over 16 years. During that unilateral moratorium on our part, the Soviet Union has developed massive chemical weapons stocks and we invite in the event of war virtually their using it without any meaningful deterrent to their doing so, save the possibility of our being forced to resort to a nuclear response. That as a strategy for the United States and our NATO allies is I think the height of folly.

We will never use them first. It is our declared policy in this Nation. We will stand behind that declared non-first use policy, but for emotional or for lack of knowledge of the facts, it would be in my judgment a disgrace for us to leave our forces in the field unprotected against an invited use of chemical weapons by our adversaries.

□ 1350

I hope that my colleagues will, before making any judgment on this issue in this session of Congress, take the time to read the recommendations and findings of the Crossen Report and of the Stoessel Commission. I do not think you can scrutinize these reports, the facts set out therein, and the conclusions that flow from them without being convinced of the necessity of a viable chemical weaponry deterrent.

Mr. STRATTON: Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. DANIEL: Mr. Chairman, the four pillars upon which military capability stands are force structure, modernization, readiness, and sustainability.

In 1981, some Members of the Congress concluded that this segment of our preparedness needed a constituency, so a Military Readiness Subcommittee was formed.

Today I wish, however, to emphasize relative spending for our national security, and touch briefly on two other matters.

It is the judgment of many Members of Congress that we are not applying our resources to the contingencies with which we may be faced for the balance of this century; in short, preparedness to address the lower end of the threat spectrum. It is the judgment of this Member that our primary concerns will be with what has become known as brushfire wars, insurgencies, and state-supported terrorism. I therefore wish to call to the attention of the Members the work which we are doing, along with the Intelligence Committee, on special operations.

After 16 years in Congress—all of which have been spent on the House Committee on Armed Services—and 4 years as chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I feel reasonably well qualified to comment on defense issues. The Pentagon's expanding budget, while certainly a factor, is not financially responsible for our outrageous budget deficits.

To put this issue into perspective, let's look at some trends in public spending over the last 30 years:

(In billions of current dollars)

Category	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975	1980	1985
Defense Department	35.1	41.5	45.9	77.1	84.9	132.8	246.3
Debt interest	4.8	6.9	8.5	14.4	23.2	52.5	130.4
Social and economic	17.0	32.5	47.6	88.8	203.3	374.1	554.1

This table reflects actual dollars spent in those years, unadjusted for inflation. But it doesn't take an expert or a mathematician to see at a glance where the lion's share of the growth is occurring in the Federal budget. Spending on social and economic programs is 32 times greater than it was 30 years ago. Interest on the debt is 27 times greater; and defense spending is 7 times the level of 1955.

Another helpful way of putting defense spending into perspective is to look at it as a percentage of net public spending at the Federal, State, and local levels:

Defense Department as percent of net public spending

1955	35.5
1960	30.3
1965	25.2
1970	25.4
1975	16.5
1980	15.3
1985	17.8

As taxpayers, we have only so much to spend to support Government services. As the foregoing indicates, defense is taking a far smaller proportion of our tax dollars than it did in the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson years. When John Kennedy came into office, one of every three public employees was in the Armed Forces. Today, it is only one in six. And we should place the 1980 figure into perspective by recalling that President Reagan was elected with a mandate to reverse the deterioration in our mili-

tary capabilities because it was generally recognized that defense spending was too low.

The fact that we have rebuilt our defenses in just 5 short years and that the readiness and morale of our men in uniform is at an all-time high is cause for comfort, not alarm. But we must not look in isolation at statistics cited to the effect that defense spending has increased from 23 percent to 29 percent of Federal spending in the last 6 years. Let us at least put those figures into perspective by recalling that it was 47.7 percent of Federal spending in John Kennedy's first year in office and 43.2 percent when Lyndon Johnson left office. And in 1985, Defense represents 25.7 percent of the Federal budget, not 29 percent.

The basis of our current budget crisis is simple: We are spending \$200 billion a year more than we take in taxes. And the simplest solution is to raise taxes. But as was demonstrated last November, the American people do not see themselves as undertaxed. Part of the reason for that, as I pointed out earlier, is that they are now spending more than \$550 billion a year to support Government services at the State and local levels. If we are not to raise taxes, then the Federal budget has to be cut. The House Armed Services Committee has voted to reduce defense spending by almost \$21 billion in fiscal year 1986. This means there will be no real growth in defense in 1986. After adjusting for inflation, the defense budget will be frozen at the 1985 level. If we go below that, we will begin to undo all our efforts of the past 5 years.

But now we come to the hard part. Cutting \$21 billion out of defense this year and restraining growth over the next 5 years will still leave us with three-fourths of the deficit problem unsolved.

It seems fashionable these days to attack defense spending and to generalize about waste from a few isolated but sensational examples of abuse as hammers and toilet seats—and they are outrageous and unacceptable. But from my vantage point, I think the military procurement agencies are populated largely by dedicated people trying conscientiously to manage our funds responsibly. It is vitally important that we get our facts straight before commenting about defense spending, because careless comments impugn the integrity of the dedicated men and women who serve within that system. For this reason, I counsel my colleagues, not to rely too much on consultants and legislative aides as they develop expertise on defense matters. For example, a recent newspaper article stated that "adjusted for inflation, defense spending has increased from about \$120 billion in 1980 to a proposed level of \$300 billion in 1986."

The actual figures in constant 1986 dollars—that is, after adjustment for inflation—are \$188.7 billion for 1980 and \$256.2 billion for 1985 with the same \$256.2 billion expected for fiscal year 1986 after congressional action. Thus, the 6-year real growth is about \$68 billion, not \$180 billion.

I understand how easy it is to fall into the trap of quoting figures inaccurately. And, occasionally I get caught doing it even though I sit through about a thousand hours a year of briefings, hearings, and personal meetings on defense programs. Perhaps the following table will help place historic defense budgets into focus and dispel the myth that they are out of control.

Defense budget authority (constant 1986 dollars in billions)

1951	248.8
1956	174.7
1961	185.6
1966	236.4
1971	203.8
1976	185.8
1981	221.9
1986	296.1

I submit that, in terms of historical trends over the past 35 years, defense is neither uncontrolled nor a budget buster. Obviously, there are things we can do to improve procurement practices and abuses, but if the Congress and the American people are serious about eliminating \$200 billion from the deficit without raising taxes, defense spending is only a small part of the answer. Unless, of course, we decide to adopt article 9 of the Japanese Constitution.

Three years of subcommittee and panel hearings on our special operations forces have begun to have a perceptible impact.

We have cooperated with our sister subcommittees in revamping the special operations R&D effort, and having it elevated to the Under Secretary of Research and Engineering level at DOD.

We have addressed the No. 1 procurement priority for SOF—the provision of adequate long-range infiltration and exfiltration aircraft through a reemphasis and restructuring of the MC-130 Combat Talon Program, and the authorization recommendation of 12 PAVE low helicopter modifications in this bill.

We have continued the momentum of the past year in seeing the successful activation of an additional active duty Special Forces group in the Army, and a third naval special warfare group, thanks to the cooperation of our colleagues in the Personnel Subcommittee, with additional personnel programmed.

We have initiated a close working relationship between the committee and the Intelligence Committee to assure adequate, sustained, and detailed oversight over our SOF units and activities.

In all, Mr. Chairman, permanent oversight and the enhancement effort for our Special Operations Forces has been extremely successful.

The panel on special operations headed by the distinguished Member from Florida will reconvene in June in order to complete its work for the first major report on SOF readiness and oversight.

Our next major initiative will be to consider readiness improvements which will stem from more effective command, control, and coordination of our joint SOS effort.

This year has been a productive one in SOF oversight and authorization. Mr. Chairman, and the matters dealing with fiscal year 1987 provide even more improvement.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, in the face of \$200 billion deficits stretching out as far as the eye can see, the committee, in their infinite wisdom, has had the temerity to include in the authorization a new spending program that will ultimately cost the American people at least \$2.3 billion, more likely \$6 billion, before it would be punished. Mr. Chairman, I am not on the committee, and I have the highest regard and respect for those who serve on it. I have been a consistent supporter of our defense authorization, a supporter of the MX missile, and I think I know an unnecessary expenditure when I see one.

This is the same program that has been defeated each time it has been offered since 1981. Last year it was defeated by 68 votes in the House and that includes, I might add, 53 votes from my side of the aisle. And this year there is a slightly new twist. There was appointed a Presidential commission headed by Ambassador Walter Stoessel, another gentleman for whom I have the highest regard and respect. That commission met first in mid-March and, I might say Mr. Chairman, that it had no one appointed to it that had previously taken a position opposed to binary nerve gas production. However, it was composed of a larger number of people who had taken a public position, in support of nerve gas production.

□ 1400

Although the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida, and myself had joined in a letter to the President urging the appointment of our former colleague from the State of Arkansas, former Congressman Ed Bethune, that appointment was not made. Rather, this commission was staffed by officers on leave from the Pentagon; indeed the executive secretary of the commission was the gentleman whose responsibility it is to con-

vince the House that we ought to produce new nerve gas weapons, Dr. Thomas Welsh. I found it amazing that this commission met for about 40 days and came out with a unanimous conclusion that we ought to do exactly what the Pentagon says we ought to do, and that is produce a new generation of nerve gas weapons after 16 years of forbearing to do exactly that.

I called the report a 40-day wonder; it is a wonder that in 40 days the commission could come to a conclusion on an issue that divided this House for many years. There was no dissent, not one word of dissent in that report.

Mr. Chairman, we do need a credible chemical deterrent. Many of the remarks made on the floor of this House by those who preceded me are correct, we do need a chemical deterrent, but the fact is that we have one, and we have had it for a long time. It is not perfect. This is not a perfect world. We have huge deficits, and if we are going to create any new spending program in this Department, it seems to me there is a tremendous burden upon those who advocate it to tell us why we should pass on to our children a tremendous additional cost that we cannot afford.

If our stockpile seriously deteriorates, and we get our fiscal house in order, we may need new chemical, even binary, weapons. I think they may be safer and better than unitary. It seems to me also that we might want to have a different mix. We might want to have more persistent agent for long-range ordnance, and more nonpersistent agent for short-range ordnance, and the mix may not be quite right in the deterrent that we have but, again, this is not a perfect world. The question is: Is this stockpile an adequate deterrent? The answer to that is yes, it is adequate, and yes, we don't need to produce new binaries this year.

Even if we were today to embark upon a new program of producing binary weapons even if we were to produce new binary weapons today our allies would not take them.

I sat down with the West Germans in my office and talked with people from their Department of Defense, and they did not even want to discuss it. It would create a split in the NATO alliance if we were to try to force these weapons upon them. The political crisis would be far greater, it seems to me, than the one we already have had with the Pershing II and the cruise missile. We could not forward deploy them. Why, then should we produce them?

Finally, let me say that I have spent a good deal of time since last year visiting various chemical warfare facilities across the country. I went to China Lake in the Mojave Desert, in California to look at the Naval Weap-

ons Testing Center there where they test the Bigeye bomb. I went to Van Nuys where the Marquards Corp. produces it. I went to the Tooele Army Depot in Utah and looked at our stockpile physically. I might say the safety that is used to make certain that we do not have terrorist attacks or problems with our stockpile is extraordinary. I went out to the Dugway Proving Ground. And I will tell my colleagues that I now have a plaque on my wall that says I am the only Member of Congress ever to stay overnight at this remote base out in the middle of Utah.

I was treated very well and I commend Dr. Welsh and his staff and the people from the Department of Defense. They certainly gave me a very good look at all this. My conclusion, is that we have an adequate stockpile, not perfect, but adequate. And that the bottom line is that there is no way that we can afford a new \$2 billion to \$6 billion program this year in a budget that is already \$200 billion out of balance.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and allowing me to follow my colleague from Illinois who spoke out against the production of binary systems.

I think this is a very important debate that takes place every year in Congress, but I think it is one debate in which most Members of Congress have not realized the full implications of the program that the Committee on Armed Services wants to go forward with.

Let me say that I think the most compelling argument is one of safety. Now we have nerve gas right now and the gentleman from Illinois conceded that we have nerve gas deposited at locations throughout this Nation, and that it would be used perhaps in retaliation to an aggressive movement and similar use by Warsaw Pact nations, and that nerve gas is separated from the communities where it is housed by thin containers and by barriers.

So you have deadly nerve gas which is kept from the community, from contact with human beings only by certain safety systems and precautionary systems that we put in place.

Now I would ask every Member of this House if you had the opportunity of taking that deadly nerve gas, for example in Arkansas, and destroying it, and putting in its place regular sulfur like a lot of Members have on the ends of their matches, and taking another element that was no more harmful than regular pesticide which many farmers use daily throughout the United States and putting that element in Utah, for example, where you

did not even have the two elements in the same State or at least had them many miles from each other, would that be preferable to having deadly nerve gas in each of those locations?

Of course the answer would have to come back from those communities and from the Members of this House a resounding yes.

We would replace deadly nerve gas with a harmless element like epoxy glue, where the two elements do not have the desired effect until they are combined. In fact the best safety measure would be to have these elements not even in the same aircraft until they go to a forward area, should we, God forbid, have to employ this binary system.

But the compelling argument for binaries is one of safety for people. By the same token if you have a forward airbase in a combat area and you have armed services personnel who have to guard those particular bunkers and ammunition dumps and you have an incoming round that destroys one of those bunkers and ruptures the canisters or the containers that that nerve gas is in, it would be much better to have a binary element in there like a pesticide or like sulfur or like common alcohol that in itself is not dangerous, that would not kill those personnel who were in that forward area than to have nerve gas.

So the compelling argument is one of safety and it is one that every Member of the House should undertake to understand this year before this debate is finished. I think if you do you are going to vote with the committee to replace deadly nerve gas throughout the United States and in forward areas with a harmless binary system that is much safer not only for our communities but for the personnel who wear the uniform of this country.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the new committee chairman, Mr. ASPIN, for his work in bringing this bill to the floor today. I believe that he has taken very positive steps in providing opportunities to the committee to examine in more detail the important policy questions relating to the programs under its jurisdiction. I hope that he will continue this trend to insure that the Congress can exercise proper oversight over defense policy.

I would also like to compliment the committee for its aggressive investigation of the defense procurement process and abuses in that process, and hope that we will be able to address this issue through separate legislation in the near future.

We will be debating again the question of what the proper overall spend-

ing level for defense should be in the coming fiscal year next week during consideration of the budget resolution. But I do think one thing is clear. The Congress is not going to support major real increases in defense for fiscal year 1986. We are going to enact some version of a spending freeze. Doing so is going to require some difficult decisions. The Armed Services Committee has recommended cuts from the President's budget totaling \$18.9 billion. I do not agree with all of these cuts. And there are areas where I think further reductions could be made without jeopardizing national security. But overall I believe that the committee has allocated their reductions in a reasonable manner and have not put undue focus on readiness accounts while trying to preserve all the procurement and R&D programs.

In my judgment there are three reasons why the Congress and American public see the need to level off on defense spending growth. And let there be no mistake that the American public has cooled to defense spending increases. When the Reagan administration first entered office 61 percent of those responding to a New York Times/CBS News poll said they thought defense spending should be increased. By last February that figure had shrunk to 16 percent.

The first reason I think this has occurred is a realization that we the defense budget has more than doubled in the last 5 years, and has increased 51 percent in real terms. Those people, including myself, who in 1981 felt that defense spending increases were required have seen that desire fulfilled. The concerns expressed 5 years ago were not a license for an unrestrained arms race.

The second factor is, of course, the massive Federal deficits that we face now and for the foreseeable future. If we do not bring them under control, our long term economic and fiscal health are in serious jeopardy. In my area, budget deficits are already producing real and serious consequences. The strong dollar they have produced has made imports more attractive and exports more difficult. The timber, aerospace, and wheat industries in Washington State are only three examples of the pinch we are feeling today, and the problem will only get worse if it is not addressed. Defense spending, which represents nearly one-third of the overall budget has to play a role in those efforts, no matter what Mr. Weinberger says.

The third factor is a perception that the problem is not so much lack of money, it is that we are not spending that money wisely. This perception is fueled by press reports on \$600 toilet seats, and overcharges by Government contractors. The American taxpayer

cannot and will not tolerate such waste of his tax dollars.

There are many facets to the question of "Are we getting what we have paid for?" As one of the founding members of the military reform caucus I know that there are many areas from the type of systems we design to interservice rivalry that lead to questions about waste and inefficiency.

There have been some steps taken to address the issue which have had a positive impact. We have established the selected acquisition report system with the Nunn-McCurdy amendment to highlight areas of major cost growth. I note with approval that the committee would extend the SAR's to include life cycle costs of the systems we are buying.

We have adopted warranty legislation and spare parts reforms that can help alleviate some of the problems in the systems. I am disappointed that some of these efforts, particularly in the area of warranties, have been watered down subsequent to House action and I hope we can restore the original direction we provided in this area.

The House has passed on two occasions reforms in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am proud to be a cosponsor once again of Mr. SKELTON's legislation and anticipate positive congressional action on these efforts to overcome interservice rivalries and to provide more timely military advice to the President.

Perhaps most important was the establishment at congressional insistence of an independent inspector general for the Department. It is through these IG reports that many of the problems in the procurement process have been uncovered.

But I think there is more that needs to be done. We need to do more than to try to point fingers at contractors, the Pentagon, or the Congress for that matter. There is plenty of blame to go around. Many of the problems are systematic. They require a thorough review of the Federal acquisition regulations and the DOD supplements to them with the objective of cutting down on excessive paperwork and overspecification.

Legislatively, there is more we can do as well. I am cosponsoring the legislation developed by Mr. BENNETT and Mr. NICHOLS, H.R. 2397, the Allowable Cost Reform Act. This legislation will help define what is in fact allowable, provide increased penalties for abuses, and help address areas of potential cozy relationships between contractor and Government contracting officer.

I have also joined in endorsing a series of amendments that the military reform caucus is presenting. The most significant of these is a requirement for dual sourcing of defense programs unless there is clear and com-

peting justification for not maintaining this important continuing competition. We have achieved major successes in the limited instances where this has been applied. We have saved nearly \$2 billion in aircraft engines through the competition on the F-100 and F-101. Just the threat of competition paid major dividends on the M-1 tank engine. The Navy Shipbuilding Program has achieved major savings when they have had more than one shipyard involved in construction of a class of ships.

A second amendment deals with the issue of quality and builds on the warranty amendment adopted last year. Under this amendment we would increase training for DOD and contractor quality control inspectors and require contractors to bear the costs of equipment that is defective because of poor quality control.

A third amendment is the so called revolving door amendment that is designed to strengthen protections against DOD personnel going from supervising a contractor to working for him.

A fourth amendment will shift the burden of proof on reasonableness of contract costs from the Government to the contractor, based on what would be considered reasonable in the private sector.

Finally, I note that the committee has recommended going to a 2-year authorization and budgeting cycle for defense. This is a step that I think will allow us the needed opportunity to take time to consider overall policy direction and provide needed continuity to the defense program. It is one that will not be easy to accomplish but it is essential in my view to having Congress play its own part in needed defense procurement reforms.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

□ 1410

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. On H.R. 1872, the 1986 Department of Defense authorization bill, as recommended by the Committee on Armed Services reflects the careful application of judgment as to what is necessary for the defense of our country, and what the Nation is willing and able to support at a time when Federal deficits are projected to reach \$200 billion.

As a part of the overall committee consideration the Seapower Subcommittee recommended reductions of more than \$800 million. These reductions were recommended because it was clear that the House would not support a defense budget of the size requested by the President. As chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, I will focus my remarks today on the

committees' actions and recommendations for that portion of the budget.

The seapower reductions will result in a slower rate of modernization for existing ships, and a slower construction pace for one major ship acquisition program, the amphibious assault ship. Additional reductions were possible because ship prices have actually declined in some instances, and have generally risen slower than anticipated, so that money authorized and appropriated for ships in previous years could be used to pay for a portion of the fiscal year 1986 ship building request.

The recommendations of the committee would provide for the construction of 23 ships and the conversion of 5 ships, a total of 28. In addition the bill would authorize the construction of 12 air cushion landing craft and other small craft. Included in the bill are authorization for the 13th Trident ballistic missile submarine and long lead authorization for continued construction of one Trident submarine per year. The bill would authorize construction of four SSN-688 class nuclear attack submarines and the acquisition of long leadtime components to allow construction of four attack submarines per year in subsequent years. That is a pace we should keep up. A total of eight mine warfare ships would be authorized by the bill, four coastal minesweepers that are to be constructed of glass reinforced plastic and utilize the surface effect ship [SES] technology, and four larger mine countermeasure ships that utilize traditional displacement hulls and are constructed of wood.

Three types of vessels would be authorized for the amphibious mission, an LHD amphibious assault ship, 2 LSD-41 class landing ship docks, and 12 air cushioned landing craft. Sealift forces would be strengthened by the three auxiliary crane ships and the aviation logistics ship authorized. In addition the bill would authorize \$203 million for the acquisition of cargo vessels for the sealift ready reserve force. The bill would also authorize two fleet oilers, two ocean surveillance ships, and an acoustic research vessel.

The budget level authorized for shipbuilding, \$10.8 billion, is below the level authorized last year. In fact, it is lower than the level authorized each year since 1980 when previous authorizations are adjusted for inflation. The low dollar level of the recommended authorization this year is a result of the previously mentioned favorable prices for ships, and the fact that the 1986 shipbuilding program contains a large number of relatively small and inexpensive ships.

The 28 new construction and conversion ships authorized by the bill would support the maintenance of a naval fleet of about 600 ships. While there is

nothing magical about a fleet of 600 ships, as compared to a fleet of 590 ships or a fleet of 610 ships, testimony before the committee has shown that a fleet of about 600 ships is the minimum necessary to carry out those military tasks that could be reasonably anticipated in a major war.

Much of the news about the procurement of ships has been very favorable. Through prudent management and an aggressive program to introduce competition in nearly all ship building programs the Navy has been able to stabilize and frequently reduce the prices of the ships being built. Only the Trident submarine and aircraft carriers are presently excluded. Deliveries of ships are generally on-time and the problems with claims in the shipbuilding industry that were so prevalent in the 1970's are behind us. However, evidence of a number of problems has come to light. These problems, which affect not only shipbuilding but defense procurement more generally, must be dealt with promptly if the American people are to retain their faith in the ability of Government to spend their tax dollars wisely.

For example, there has been wide publicity concerning the giving and receiving of gifts at ship launchings. While there is a long history and tradition associated with gifts at ship launchings, it is clearly in the public interest that such gifts be strictly limited. The bill includes a provision prohibiting a Government employee from accepting a gift valued in excess of \$100 at any event marking a ship construction milestone.

The so-called revolving door between Government employment and private industry is another area that present legislation does not adequately address. There have been cases, recently publicized, where former Government officials have accepted post-Government employment with firms with which they have had business dealings while employed by the Government. Legislation has been introduced and passed in subcommittee to deal with this abuse. It will be offered as an amendment to the defense authorization bill when the bill is considered for amendment.

A third area where additional legislation is clearly required is in the area of costs that are properly chargeable to the Government under a Government contract. Congressman NICHOLS and I have conducted investigations about this problem, and have drafted legislation to correct the problems we have found. This will probably also be introduced as an amendment to this bill, in addition to being a freestanding bill.

Mr. Chairman, solutions to the problems of defense procurement are being found and acted on. The shipbuilding authorization recommended for 1986 is

a prudent level that will support the maintenance of a strong Navy and deserves the support of the House.

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER].

Mr. COURTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense authorization budget is one that I am not enamored with; one that we will probably have to live with, there is no doubt about that. I have real problems with the level of spending, but nevertheless one of the areas that I have the greatest problem with is the strategic defense initiative.

I think probably one of the biggest, if not clearly the biggest technical and strategic and moral issues of the day is, what are we going to do with offensive weapons? What are we going to do with our strategic relations with the Soviet Union?

So far, during the last 15 or 20 years, ever since we moved from the time of clear strategic superiority by the United States over the Soviet Union, we have existed with a shared doctrine with the Soviet Union called mutually assured destruction. That doctrine is based on a paradox, and the paradox is the fact that there is safety in vulnerability; that provided that the Soviet Union and the United States both keep their civilian populations vulnerable to a retaliatory offensive strike, both sides would then be deterred from venturing down that road.

Some people will argue that the doctrine of mutually assured destruction works and has worked so far, and therefore we should not tamper with it. For those people that advocate that particular doctrine, for those people that believe it is the moral doctrine to have, for those people that believe that from now and into the future, states will always act rationally, I commend them. They can vote zero money for defensive research and development.

The doctrine of mutually assured destruction is based on some assumptions. Some of those assumptions, when you analyze them, frighten you.

First, it is based on the assumption that states and nations, both now and forever in the future, will act rationally, there will be no irrational acts by the Soviet Union, no irrational acts by any country in the future that will have nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them; through the air, ICBM's, or sea-launched ballistic missiles.

But I ask the question: Do you really believe that from now for the next 1,000 years always, nations will act rationally? I suggest they will not. I suggest there will be a day when some nation, for whatever reason, will act irrationally. And if they do, how can the doctrine of assured destruction prevent anything? Indeed, it cannot. De-

terrence is over, and the assured destruction of civilization as we know it in the world will happen.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman in the well for his remarks, as they are most appropriate. This is the key issue. I want to compliment him also for the tremendous speech he gave downtown and the recent booklet that I had a chance to see, a blue pamphlet. I wish every Member and every American could read that, because it is the best work on this subject. I would like to suggest that the gentleman share this with all the Members of the House and the Members of the other body and also the people who are making decisions around the country on this very important topic, because I think all the key issues are addressed and the gentleman goes into great detail and in very logical order and comes to, I think, the proper conclusions.

I want to thank the gentleman in the well for all of his work on this very important topic.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I certainly understand the gentleman's willingness to consider the strategic defense initiative, and we are underway with an R&D program that will be funded over the next 5, 10, maybe 15 years. But even the most optimistic individual I think recognizes that it is going to be a while before we can make a judgment about how to implement an SDI should we decide that that is the correct way to go.

So I am troubled by the gentleman's statement that deterrence is over. Deterrence is not over. We are going to have to rely on deterrence for 15, 20, or 30 additional years. I would caution my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, that we maybe do not want to say that deterrence is over, because we are going to have to rely on deterrence for the foreseeable future.

I would like to ask the gentleman what he thinks about that.

Mr. COURTER. I would be happy to respond to the gentleman's comments. Deterrence is not over today. Deterrence would not be over even if both sides or everybody had deployed defensive systems. You could have deterrence based on offensive threats and also deterrence based on being able to defend yourself. So deterrence is not going to be over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has expired.

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this additional time.

Mr. Chairman, to suggest that it will take 25 or 30 years to move toward defensive systems I think is wrong. We could move toward defensive systems much more quickly than that.

I am not suggesting that what we should do today is to eliminate the doctrine of mutually assured destruction. That is the only thing we can at the present time have. What I am suggesting, if I were to have my full 5 or 10 minutes to myself, is that we should fully and robustly research and develop the ideas of defensive systems so that we could make that very important and crucial decision in 4 or 5 years as to whether we want to start deploying defensive systems. I would argue that we should fully fund it. I would argue that research and development is going to show that we can have effective defenses and we should sooner rather than later start the gradual shift from deterrence based on the threat of retaliation, the threat of murder, the threat of killing civilians, toward a doctrine where you are actually defending yourself and civilian populations.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will just yield briefly, I want to say I am glad that the gentleman agrees that we still must rely on the policy of deterrence, which has worked up to this point, because I think it is essential.

Mr. COURTER. If the gentleman will permit me to take back my time, my point is that there is probably something better, that I would ask anybody in this body, they will have a hard time defending the doctrine of mutually assured destruction as the doctrine that we should adopt as a nation for the next 100 years or 500 years, because it is based on some assumptions, and when you analyze those assumptions, they give you a great deal of concern. One of the assumptions is that states will always be deterred, states will always act rationally, and that is basically one of my first points.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

My time is rapidly going, and I wanted to mention a number of things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has again expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the gentleman.

The concept of deterrence with the concept of retaliatory offensive forces assumes also that no mistakes will ever occur, that they are not going to be launched by an irate or irrational

admiral in a submarine someplace in the world that would launch ICBM's. Deterrence based on offensive threats, we are certainly not going to stop that. It is based on the assumption that it will never fail, because if you have deterrence based on mutually assured destruction and if you do fail, if it does break down, you have nothing, but if you have deterrence based on deployed defensive systems and it breaks down, at least you can defend yourself.

The fate of the world, therefore, today relies on the theory that assumes that there will be no irrational act, assumes that no mistakes will ever occur, and assumes that the theory will never fail. And I think we can do better. And what we are going to do and what we should do is fully fund the research and development effort in strategic defenses.

And that leads me, basically, to my main point, and I will be able, I am sure, to discuss it more fully under the 5-minute rule.

The Research and Development Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and the full Armed Services Committee cut one-third the amount of money that we need in order to do proper types of research and development in strategic defense. That one-third cut will shove off the day that this body can make the rational decision as to whether you want to deploy for an additional 2 years. That one-third cut of better than \$1.2 billion is on top of a cut of about \$300 million last year and, as sure as I am standing here, probably is going to be cut by a similar cut in the future, 1986 or 1987.

The point I am trying to make is that most people agree that we should do the research and development, and if we are going to do that, we are going to have to pay for it. And it is not a great deal of money. It is a great deal of money in static terms, it is a great deal of money when you are looking at the individual state. But we are talking in terms of about 2 percent of the entire DOD budget for the next 5 years. I do not think that is much. I think that is essential. I would urge my colleagues, when we go under the 5-minute rule, to think carefully about whether this is the proper level of spending in this area. I think it is not.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would like to thank the acting chairman of the Committee today for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my distinguished colleagues and state that we on the Armed Services Committee labored long and hard to make what we believe are the least damaging reductions to the fiscal year 1986 defense budget.

This was not an easy task, Mr. Chairman. Many of us regularly attend defense briefings on Soviet activities around the world—thus, we know that the threat to the United States is real and that this Nation's defense is our first and foremost duty as elected representatives. Nevertheless, we did find areas in the President's budget where significant savings could be made.

Although I am not altogether satisfied with some of the bill's provisions, I wish to commend my colleagues for working diligently to resolve the difficult issues we faced and for setting priorities for next year's defense spending.

I am particularly pleased with the efforts of the Military Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee. Not only were we able to reduce the administration's overall personnel request of \$73.4 billion by \$4.3 billion, we were able to recommend a number of benefit enhancements for active duty, retired, and Reserve members and their families. In addition, we included several measures designed to improve the effectiveness of the reserves.

For example, the current legislative authority for the package of incentives for enlistment and reenlistment in the reserves expires on September 30, 1985. The committee approved an extension and enhancement of these programs while also making clear that the new GI bill approved last year is to be the primary recruiting tool for the guard and reserve. And the committee would like to commend the Army and the other services for moving ahead to implement the GI education bill for the Active Force on July 1.

H.R. 1872 proposes several improvements that will impact on the Nation's mobilization resource: the individual Ready Reserve. I have for many years been deeply troubled about the status of the individual Ready Reserve. Many questions remain unanswered. How up to date are the addresses? How many individuals would respond? What is their physical condition and the recency of their skill training? Some type of muster test or annual training requirement would go a long way toward providing answers to these questions, and H.R. 1872 contains several initiatives to start the ball rolling.

Another initiative of major importance is the new program to increase the number of health professionals in critical combat medical skills in the Guard and Reserve. Seventy percent of the health professionals required to provide combat casualty care under a full mobilization situation would come from the Reserve components. Yet, there are critical shortages of surgeons and operating room nurses. Defense health officials have estimated

that three-quarters of those wounded during the first few days of a major conflict would not receive life-saving surgical care. H.R. 1872 proposes a loan repayment program and limited utilization of the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program to attract health professionals in criteria combat medical skills to the reserves.

As a long-time advocate of increased utilization for the reserve components, I urge my colleagues to support the initiatives contained in H.R. 1872 designed to increase the effectiveness of the Reserves. My colleagues will remember that the Armed Services Committee has emphasized its belief for a number of years that Reserve personnel should be considered as a means of manning future force structure increases.

Today, there is no doubt that a well-equipped, well-trained and adequately manned Reserve or Guard unit can get the job done. Reserve forces currently perform critical mobilization missions as well as some day-to-day operational missions—for example, Air Force strategic refueling and strategic airlift.

I recently had the pleasure of traveling to Central America with Lieutenant General Walker, Chief National Guard Bureau, to observe firsthand National Guard participation in joint exercises with Panamanian and Honduran forces. I was uniformly impressed with the capabilities, dedication, and enthusiasm of the National Guardsmen with whom I met. The Reserves have certainly come a long way since the days of strength shortfalls, thanks to the Reserve recruiting and retention incentives approved by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to continue to work to improve the readiness and effectiveness of the Reserves in the future—and this bill is a step in the right direction.

□ 1430

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to present title IX of H.R. 1827. This title contains the fiscal year 1986 authorization for seven Department of Energy defense programs that are under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. The vote to approve title IX by the subcommittee was 14 yeas to 3 nays. The subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 1827, which is now title IX, on February 20, 21, 22, 25, and 27. The full committee reported this title by voice vote.

The Department of Energy budget request for defense programs—approximately \$8 billion—amounted to about 2½ percent of the total fiscal

year budget request for national defense. We have reduced that to approximately \$7.7 billion. In marking up the bill, the subcommittee was aware that substantial reductions would have to be made in order to meet the committee's authorization target of no growth beyond inflation. The committee has done this by reducing the authorization request by about \$241 million.

In recommending reductions from the request, the committee has followed several principles:

First, we made allowances in some areas, but not all, for inflation.

Second, we allowed for the full authorization of almost all increases requested that are necessary for safeguards and security of facilities, weapons and weapons components, nuclear materials, and nuclear weapons information. The Department had budgeted an increase of \$55 million above fiscal year 1984 for this purpose.

Third, it was necessary to authorize projects and activities that are necessary to comply with over 50 Federal laws such as the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and Occupational Health and Safety [OSHA] regulations imposed by the EPA and other Federal and State agencies. The fiscal year 1986 DOE request contained \$360 million for environmental, safety, and health programs. It was also necessary to provide for payment of recently imposed State sales and use taxes. These items require estimated increases of \$75 million to \$100 million over last year.

Fourth, there are some 44 ongoing construction projects requiring additional incremental funding in fiscal year 1985. Many of these projects are necessary to restore and replace facilities and equipment that have been operated for periods of 30 to 40 years.

We have also recognized the need for program growth in some areas that will be necessary to handle in increased workload. An example of this is the increase in demand for naval nuclear reactor fuels.

And finally, we found it necessary to recommend that certain research and development programs such as the Inertial Confinement Fusion [ICF] Program and the Plasma Separation Process Program be restored since they can make important economic and military contributions to national security in the future.

After the above mandatory items and the committee's recommendations have been added and subtracted, there is no real program growth in the Department of Energy area.

In summary, the budget request was for \$7,958.7 million. The subcommittee is recommending authorizations that total to \$7,718.1 million—a net reduction of \$240.6 million. This allows an increase of \$384 million, of which: \$134 million—10 percent—of the in-

crease is for waste management: \$168 million—44 percent—is for materials production, and there are relatively small increases in weapons research and development, testing and production, averaging 4.9 percent.

I would point out that this bill supports seven programs that are vital to national security, such as: the Navy's nuclear propulsion capability; the technical basis for U.S. deterrent capabilities; and the only U.S. scientific and technical capability for verification and monitoring several arms control agreements, including nuclear testing and nuclear nonproliferation treaties. These programs also provide nuclear materials for defense and civilian uses, and the recycle of naval nuclear fuels for reuse. In addition, these DOE programs also provide for the continuing management and permanent disposal of radioactive wastes that have been generated for defense purposes since the 1940's. This same waste management technology is being applied to future solutions to civilian waste management and disposal.

The committee has recommended very few additions to the request. As I mentioned previously, we are recommending the restoration of \$75 million for additional operating expenses and \$10 million for additional equipment in order to fully utilize the capabilities of recently completed inertial confinement fusion research facilities during the next fiscal year. These facilities have been expensive to build and offer great promise only if the required experimental activities can be continued. This would not be possible at the budget level requested by the administration. Even with the additional amounts recommended, there will be a reduction of 10 percent or more in the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program during the next fiscal year. This increase has been more than offset by reductions in other areas.

In another area, the subcommittee is recommending the addition of \$13.3 million in operating expenses to continue the development of a plasma separation process to purify, at a much lower cost, uranium and other special metal assets now in the inventory. This uranium cannot be utilized in its present form. Closely connected with this effort, the committee has added \$8 million to begin design of a plant project for the refinement of plutonium through the special isotope separation process. These two processes will more than pay for themselves through the recovery of uranium and plutonium that cannot otherwise be used, or which could be made usable only at much greater expense.

Title IX, as reported, contains 14 general provisions. The first nine general provisions—sections 921 through 929—deal with housekeeping items such as reprogrammings, limitations

on the use of funds, transfer authority, and other matters that have been contained in similar authorization bills since 1977.

The five new general provisions—sections 931 through 935—adopted by the committee would:

First, section 931 imposes general reductions totaling \$32.3 million on the total amounts that would be authorized;

Second, section 932 authorizes the Secretary of Energy to carry out a contract that would provide a final financial settlement with the city of Oak Ridge, and Roane and Anderson Counties, TN, under the Atomic Energy Assistance Act of 1955;

Third, section 933 authorizes the Secretary of Energy to obligate not more than \$5 million of funds otherwise available to the Department to renovate a Department of Energy-owned building at the Oak Ridge Reservation, but only if this renovation is necessary to the requirements that Department of Energy may have in connection with the Strategic Defense Initiatives Program;

Fourth, section 934 prohibits the use of funds authorized for appropriation for propaganda, certain advertising, lobbying, and for other purposes that are not necessary for a Department of Energy contractor's operation in support of Department of Energy defense programs. Although most of these prohibitions have been included in annual Department of Defense appropriations language, those appropriations acts have not applied to Department of Energy contractors; and

Fifth, section 935 technically amends the fiscal year 1985 authorization act.

As the committee reports shows, the committee has recommended numerous monetary changes in order to arrive at the required overall reductions, while keeping DOE's defense programs in balance with those authorized for the Department of Defense. The sole purpose of DOE's defense programs are to support DOD's requirements. For example, DOE helps support some 144 operating Navy combatant ships and submarines, with 24 additional ships authorized and funded. DOE also supports the Trident submarine, Trident I and Trident II missile programs, the Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missile programs, and other programs long supported by the Congress. DOE's research and development laboratories also do important work on advanced conventional weapons and support the infrastructure for advanced energy research.

Title IX represents a balanced, no real growth budget for fiscal year 1986 and should be supported in connection with the remainder of H.R. 1872.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not recall the year, but sometime in the 1950's, when President Eisenhower and the Nation were facing unprecedented deficits of something like \$5 or \$10 billion a year, and inflation rates somewhere in the range of 1.5 or 2 percent, he made the statement that we are more likely to succumb to an internal fiscal foe than we are to a foreign aggressor.

Well, if that was true in the 1950's, and a former general like President Eisenhower could make a statement like that, I certainly believe that that is the case today.

I will be offering an amendment to the Defense authorization bill along with my colleague, BRUCE MORRISON of Connecticut, that will freeze fiscal year 1986 defense funding at the fiscal year 1985 appropriations level. I believe this freeze is a necessary step if Congress is to responsibly address the deficit in a fair manner.

I have in the past supported the President's defense modernization program, and I commend the President for his efforts to build up our national security. My commitment to a strong national security system has not been diminished with my support of a freeze. I know that the President recognizes the importance of addressing our rising deficits. If Congress fails to bring the deficits under control, our economic stability will be threatened. But a strong defense is not possible without a strong economy.

Reducing the Federal budget is not an easy undertaking. Those of us in the 92 Group agonized over many of the specific cuts and freezes that had to be made to arrive at what we feel is an equitable budget. We concluded that any budget, if it is to win the support of the American people, needs to spread its savings across-the-board. Defense can be no exception, particularly when the public perception is one of a Pentagon spending out of control.

In freezing the Pentagon budget, national security would not be jeopardized. A substantial defense buildup has already taken place in the 1980's with more than \$1 trillion spent on defense over the past 5 years. Defense spending has grown at an annual real rate of 8.3 percent over those 5 years, pushing military spending to higher levels, in constant dollars, than prevailed during the Vietnam war. If a freeze were implemented, the defense budget would be frozen at a very high level.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Did I understand the gentleman to say that his desire and his motion was to freeze at the 1985 level; is that correct?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. STRATTON. That is precisely what the committee has done. It is a little strange, it seems to me, that a committee that ordinarily has been gung-ho for increasing the budget should come in with a freeze at the 1985 level and then we get attacked for it. We do not even get any credit for it.

Does the gentleman want to freeze the programs that are carried out in Connecticut or in his own State?

Mr. CHANDLER. The difference between the 92 budget that is proposed and this one is that yours recognizes inflation and ours does not; that is the difference between the two budgets.

Mr. STRATTON. Four little percent of inflation for the entire year. That is hardly considered inflation at all.

It seems to me that we somehow lose sight of exactly what the committee has done, and when we come in with the kind of a bill that we think the House wants, then we are criticized.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, I think what we can do is put this amendment up and we will find out if this amendment or the committee's budget is what the House wants. This is a constructive alternative; it is not, my remarks were not meant nor are they an attack on the committee's work. I have been respectful to the gentleman and to all of the others. I am simply stating my opinion, which I have a perfect right to do.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

I think what we are talking about is the gentleman's proposal talks about an absolute freeze; the acting chairman was talking about 4 percent inflation.

We are talking about 12 billion real dollars here; difference at the very least.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BYRON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Basically what you are really doing is cutting. Because I think in this day and age, when we look at our proposals, if you do not take the inflation factor in, then basically, from last year, you are offering a cut.

Mr. CHANDLER. What you would in effect end up with, I would say, is about a minus 4 in fiscal 1986, and

then our proposal would be a zero, zero on into the outyears.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER] has expired.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that over a period of time, as I have been a member of the Military Reform Caucus, a group that tries to thoughtfully look at this, and made up of Members of both sides of the aisle, conservatives as well as liberals, one of the questions that has often been asked of the Pentagon is, "Would you prioritize for us what you want, and in light of facing budget reductions, what would be your lowest priority?" We have never really received an answer to that question. It is one that I think deserves to be answered. It is one that we are going to continue to ask.

In light of the lack of confidence that I sense among the American people for what is going on in the Defense Establishment, it is an answer that I think not only they deserve, but certainly the Members of Congress who have to make these decisions.

Mr. Chairman, our armed services can actually be made more effective by freezing the Pentagon budget at its already very high level and closely examining the way the military does business. Congress needs to look at reforms that will give us greater security for the tax dollars that are invested in defense.

We have learned over the past few years that money alone cannot provide us with the security we need. Increased defense budgets have brought high costs and overhead, contracting abuses and improprieties, and stories of \$400 hammers and \$600 toilet seats. I have found in my discussions with constituents that the strong consensus of a couple of years ago for increased defense budgets has been undermined by the highly publicized accounts of waste, mismanagement, and abuse. My constituents don't feel they are getting their money's worth, and they want to see a more accountable Department of Defense.

In many cases, we find that we are getting less bang for the buck out of Pentagon spending. One example I find especially incredible comes in the area of aircraft procurement. Taken together, the Air Force and Navy procurement budgets amount to about 36 percent of the total procurement budget between fiscal year 1982 and 1985. Even though the aircraft budget increased 75 percent in constant dollars from the fiscal year 1978-81 level, 11 fewer airplanes were purchased.

The Air Force is not alone. The Navy budget for new shipbuilding went up 47 percent during the same

timeframe, but we got 17 percent fewer major combatants. Even in cases when procurement quantities increase, they increase at a much slower rate than procurement budgets. Clearly, quantity increases have not kept pace with budget increases.

Even with a freeze, congressional analysis shows that outlays would still go up by about \$15 billion. With proper reforms, the defense budget would still be more than enough for deterrence and arms control leverage.

The Armed Services Committee would be charged with finding the ways to freeze the defense budget if the Morrison-Chandler amendment is passed. We need to implement concrete management improvements designed to reduce today's excessive costs, increase readiness and procure large quantities of effective, reasonably priced weapons.

Support for this freeze is not limited to Democrats and liberal Republicans. I consider myself a conservative on defense issues, and I would not support such a freeze if it undermined our national security. I am convinced, however, that this proposal is supported by the American people and that our national interests would best be served through a defense freeze that is part of a comprehensive effort to deal with rising deficits.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

□ 1440

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a chance to take a look at this legislation and I want to congratulate the committee in at least one instance for a really terrific job. The committee made the right decisions on the MCM, so I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and the best military mind in the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], for their work in this area. I also commend my very good friend and the gentleman we all admire, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], for his work. Without the mine countermeasure ships we could not move our Navy.

No matter how many ships we build, if they are bottled up in the harbors they are not going to be of much avail to our country. So I compliment this committee for going along and authorizing all four MCM's, requested by the Navy.

I have had a chance to take a look at the construction of these ships. The job, in my opinion and that of others who are familiar with these ships, is being very well done. These 224-ft long, ships are meeting their scheduled delivery date, which is something that cannot be said for every project the Government is involved in.

These ships are being built on the Great Lakes, on Lake Michigan, by Peterson Builders and Marinette Marine, both respected shipbuilders which consistently deliver a quality product to the Navy. In addition some 25 other States are vendors and contributing to the MCM's. As I have said before, without the MCM's, we could not move our Navy. This is a very good investment for the American people, and that is why I commend this committee for the work that they have done in this area.

The production of the four ships in 1986 will have several distinct advantages for the taxpayer, for the Navy, and for the local economy. It will maintain the planned delivery schedule, thus holding down costs. There are no Government projects that I am aware of that are holding down the costs like the MCM Program, and it is going to be, I think, a real advantage for our Navy. It will maintain a steady shipyard workload. It will maintain a steady vendor production line. And it will provide good competition between the contractors.

So I commend the committee for their insight and for their intelligence in this matter, and it gives me a renewed sense of confidence, and I think the American people, too, when they see a subcommittee like this looking at how every dollar is spent; that we get a return for every dollar that is spent. I think that is what the American taxpayers are asking for and I think that is what this subcommittee is delivering, especially in this instance.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and I wish to highlight some of the action that this committee has taken on this bill.

As has been already mentioned by several of my colleagues, the Armed Services Committee is recommending a bill that authorizes no real growth in the defense budget. Essentially, this means returning to the levels appropriated by the Congress for the fiscal year 1985 defense budget and allowing for inflation. As such, the committee recommends reducing by \$19.6 billion the total defense budget request of \$322 billion. Because the committee determined that it was necessary to ensure adequate growth in the readiness accounts, the largest reductions unfortunately were made in the investment accounts, and in particular, the procurement accounts of the military services.

H.R. 1872 provides a 2-percent negative real growth for fiscal year 1986 for the procurement programs under the purview of the Subcommittee on

Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems. This level of spending translates into a reduction of \$7.1 billion, and means that we are recommending reductions in the amount of inflation provided for the procurement accounts. Our task was not easy—setting defense priorities while bringing the defense budget into line with our other national priorities. I believe that the committee has done a very responsible job in establishing a balanced, affordable set of national defense priorities.

To meet these fiscal constraints while providing for a credible U.S. defense posture, the committee established several policy guidelines. First, the committee decided to continue ongoing programs, at steady production rates before ambitious new programs were initiated. For example, the committee maintained the production rate of 840 M-1 tanks for fiscal year 1986. Because of contract savings and transfer of funds from foreign military sales of M-48-A5 tanks, the committee authorized the procurement of 840 M-1 tanks and reduced the budget request by almost \$80 million. Reducing the procurement quantities of M-1 tanks would have been an easy way to provide savings in the overall defense budget but that approach would only delay the time required to complete the Army's modernization program for M-1 tanks.

Second, the committee decided to defer or terminate 30 costly procurement programs. This historic action resulted in savings of almost \$2 billion in this budget and will provide additional savings in future years. In some cases, such as the E-6A Tacamo strategic communications aircraft, the committee decided that costly new starts were not affordable this year and recommended deferral. In other cases, such as the P-3C Orion submarine hunting aircraft, the committee deleted procurement funds because of concern regarding escalating unit costs.

The committee also examined closely the major acquisition programs in the defense budget, and undertook several management initiatives to reduce potential risks to the Government and the taxpayer. The Army's Sergeant York air defense Divad system is a good example where the committee exercised leadership and provided stringent limitations on the obligation of procurement funds.

The committee reduced the budget request for this system by almost \$200 million. The committee also recommends language in the bill that fences the obligation of funds until and unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that testing has demonstrated conclusively that the system fulfills the performance specifications of the contract. The contractor must also provide a warranty to that effect. With these provisions, and this cut-

back the committee guarantees that the Army will purchase a weapon system that performs according to the original specifications—with no additional cost to the taxpayer.

One of the major priorities preserved by the committee was its continued commitment to the modernization of our Guard and Reserve Forces. The committee believes very strongly that providing modern equipment to the Guard and Reserve Forces is essential. Many of these units will be among the first to deploy in the event of a conflict. To continue these initiatives, the committee recommends authorization of almost \$700 million to purchase equipment specifically for the Guard and Reserve. Some of the key initiatives include: Increased emphasis on air defense capabilities for the Army National Guard, additional airlift assets for the Air National Guard, and additional medium attack aircraft for the Naval Reserve.

Finally, I would like to highlight one of the major initiatives undertaken in H.R. 1872 that will strengthen the management of procurement programs. The committee recommends strengthening the selected acquisition reports [SAR]—the main vehicle for alerting Congress to potential problems in weapons systems. The SAR have been trimmed in recent years to the point where they have become useless documents for congressional oversight. H.R. 1872 also directs the Department to provide full life-cycle costs for each acquisition program included in the SAR after the first quarter of fiscal year 1985. This initiative will allow the Congress to judge new acquisition programs not only on the basis of investment, but also on the basis of ownership costs.

Mr. Chairman, I think some of these recommendations are long overdue. I also believe very strongly that we cannot cut our defense any further. I think this committee has acted rationally, with a great deal of thought and consideration, with a package that meets our national security requirements and also meets our fiscal restraints.

□ 1450

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HILLIS].

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to begin by commending my colleague who just spoke on the remarks she has made about the bill. I think she was very, very accurate in stressing the fact that this is a very austere measure. It has had very close scrutiny by the committee and all the subcommittees, and every action that could be taken to save money and to get more defense for the dollar has

been taken by the committee, there are cuts there of well over \$18 billion from the proposals originally submitted, and, as the gentlewoman mentioned, 30-some procurement programs have been terminated.

This is a complicated bill. There are some 200 pages in the legislation, H.R. 1872, and in the committee report that accompanies it there are almost 500 pages. So there is a good day's reading for anybody who wants to sit down and go through this.

I again stress that this is a well-drafted bill. Each of the subcommittees of the full committee, I think, has done a good job. For many years I have been a member of the Personnel Subcommittee, and I would like to talk a few minutes about the action taken by that subcommittee as a part of the full bill.

Our chairman of the subcommittee is also the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], and as a rule, I find myself in substantial agreement with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation. On this occasion, however, I have very mixed emotions.

I am very troubled by the decision of the committee to reduce the authorization level for military personnel by \$4 billion in order to force the Department of Defense to submit a proposal to restructure the military retirement system.

Although I am not opposed to consideration of alternatives to change the system and support a mandate to the Department of Defense to submit a proposal for prospective and cost-effective changes, I do not agree that a \$4 billion reduction in the retirement accrual account should be made before the committee has received a proposal to consider.

There is simply too much uncertainty attached to this course of action. We are putting the cart before the horse.

I am pleased that the committee approved a number of long overdue personnel enhancements such as improvements in the level of reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred by military members when moving on Government orders.

It is ridiculous that military families must often go into debt in order to complete such moves. The improvements proposed by the committee still do not go nearly as far as the benefits currently provided to Federal civil service workers, but they are an important step in the right direction.

In addition to restructuring the mileage and per diem allowances payable on a Government-ordered move to parallel the reimbursements provided to Federal civilian employees, the committee also strongly recommended three permanent change of station ini-

tatives included in the President's budget: Increasing the household goods weight allowances, funding a temporary lodging expense of up to 4 days, and reimbursing travel expenses for dependents of junior enlisted personnel within the continental United States.

One of the recurring themes that emerged from subcommittee hearings was the serious strain on the family budget—particularly for lower ranking enlisted personnel—of having to set up a household in very high cost areas like Fort Ord, for example. In such cases, young families may be forced to turn to charity for food and other necessities in order to have sufficient up-front cash to pay security deposits for housing.

H.R. 1872 contains two provisions to address this problem. First, it authorizes the payment in advance of both the basic allowance for quarters and variable housing allowance. Second, it doubles the current dislocation allowance, which may also be paid in advance. These two improvements should go a long way toward easing the cash flow problem many families face when they arrive at the new duty station.

All military families making a Government-ordered move will be better off as a result of the comprehensive package of improvements included in H.R. 1872. I am particularly pleased to note that those who will benefit most are those in the greatest need: junior enlisted personnel.

We must not overlook another vital element of military compensation: pay. The committee decided to defer the 3-percent pay raise—until January 1, 1986—in anticipation of similar action for Federal civilian workers.

We must be very careful about the pay issue in the future, however, to ensure that we do not have a reoccurrence of the recruitment and retention problems of the late 1970's.

The disparity between military pay and private sector wages is already precariously close to the pay disparity of those days. As the economy improves, pay levels will become an increasingly important factor in the career decisions for our Nation's men and women in uniform.

With the exception of the retirement proposal, H.R. 1872 takes a giant step forward in terms of personnel benefits and I urge my colleagues to consider the bill favorably.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL].

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the issue in this defense bill that I think is the No. 1 problem facing us in this House, and that is to make some firm decisions to stop the waste, fraud, and abuse that is going on in our Pentagon. Contractors are stealing taxpay-

ers' money and ripping off this Nation to the detriment of the fighting men and women of this Nation.

In 1981, when I first came on the Armed Services Committee, my first speech was in regard to a massive supplemental that we were passing that day. I pointed out that we were increasing the defense budget much too quickly, and that, while we at that time had the American people behind us to have a stronger and a better defense and to spend more on defense, it was clear that if we accelerated the spending too fast, we could not keep control of it and the money would not be spent properly. Unfortunately, it was not all spent properly.

We have seen public opinion shift from 1981, when the vast majority of the people wanted an increase in defense spending, to today, 1985, when the vast majority of the people want a decrease in defense spending.

Why is that? Well, it is our responsibility to make sure that the money is spent right, and I have to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], who spoke earlier today, and also my colleague and brother, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], because they have uncovered much of this waste, abuse, and fraud. In fact, the subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services under the direction of Chairmen NICHOLS and BENNETT have turned up \$1.07 billion in questionable expenses by seven defense contractors. In the audit they performed they found \$1 in every \$33 was illegal. Let us discuss what some of this money was wasted upon and stolen from, referring to the taxpayers' money in this defense spending, money that was improperly spent. They found that \$10,710 in charges from one firm was put in to recover losses from an executive barber shop. They found that \$12,333 was spent for two season tickets for the Los Angeles Forum for hockey and basketball games. They found \$160 in taxes paid to a foreign government in connection with overseas sales of commercial products. They found \$959 for golf fees for 1 single day. They found \$1,099,000 in charges to recover the losses of an employee cafeteria. They found \$62,000 for public relations costs after one firm's aircraft had crashed.

□ 1500

This is the tip of the iceberg. This is money that was spent wrongly. This is taxpayer money that did not go to defense, but went to these other projects that have nothing to do with defense.

The GAO has found that 11 top contractors routinely charged the Pentagon for public relations, personal travel, and promotional giveaways.

To make matters worse, Pentagon auditors generally questioned these costs, but less than one-half of the charges were disallowed by its negotiators; so even when they questioned them and found them, they still let half go on to be charged to the taxpayers, when they had nothing to do with our defense.

The Inspector General of the Department of Defense, is responsible for recommending penalties for defense procurement officials, but he has no authority to stop these payments. Inspector General Sherick has said in testimony before the Energy and Commerce Committee that if he had the power, he would suspend or debar the individuals who had committed these acts and stolen this money from the American people. He testified that his office is investigating dozens of major defense contractors, but that the Justice Department has been reluctant to prosecute many of these cases where he has discovered the evidence.

To stop these abuses, I have introduced H.R. 2262, which I will put in the form of an amendment to this bill, this authorization. That bill authorizes the inspector general to stop payments in the case of waste, fraud or abuse or excessive charges when the routine Pentagon audit procedures have failed to protect the interest or the security of the United States.

I brought this bill up last year on the floor. Unfortunately, there was not a great deal of interest. Now we have a lot of cosponsors, because the American people are sick of it and they are not going to take it anymore. That money should go to the defense of this Nation. If it is not needed there, it should go back in the taxpayers' pockets, because we are talking about billions of dollars. We are talking about eroding the confidence of the American people in how their money is being spent.

I cannot say enough as I conclude about the fact that I know the other members of this House Armed Services Committee share my concern about this. We have decided as a committee to bring these questions to the floor and decide those questions here before the full House because of their great importance.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY].

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, as we discuss this budget, I would like to first start off by commending my colleagues who are indeed here on the floor. When we consider that this budget authorization will make up one-third of the entire Federal budget and look around and see how few people are here to listen to it, it makes you wonder.

What I am somewhat concerned about and I think it was very eloquently described by our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], is the fact that we were almost compelled as a committee to target a budget to what will be anticipated as the budget coming out of the Budget Committee. That made it rather difficult for us to present to our colleagues a budget that should be designed by examining the threat, examining the requirement to meet the threat, examining the requirement to meet the over 40 treaty obligations we have with our friends around the globe. That is to me somewhat disconcerting.

Back during the season between September and November of last year, the candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Mondale, called for a 3-percent real growth in the defense budget. Obviously, the President submitted a budget that has a 5.9-percent real growth factor in it and we, the committee, were compelled to come out with a budget that has zero percent real growth.

I would hope that the Members of the whole House recognize that the committee worked extremely hard to bring in a budget that would be acceptable to everyone.

I would hope that the attitude will not be that the Armed Services Committee historically bloats a budget with the knowledge that it will be pared back on the floor of the House, because that is not the case at all.

In fact, speaking for many of my colleagues, they are as frustrated as I am that we were constrained to come in with the budget at the level that it comes in at.

One of the issues in the budget that I would like to caution all my colleagues on is the issue of the retirement aspect. We removed \$4 billion from the request for the retirement program and in doing so we did not present to our colleagues a change in the retirement system. Indeed, we asked the Defense Department to make proposals that we could scrutinize and accept that would meet that \$4 billion reduction, but we do not have that in hand today.

I only point out to my colleagues that back in April 1983 we made changes to the Federal retirement system. We said, yes, we can cut back, change the Federal retirement system and at a later date we will rewrite the bill and we will be able to present a retirement system.

To date, Mr. Chairman, we do not have a Federal retirement system. We cannot offer a new employee coming into the Federal Government a retirement system. I am fearful that this will happen to those who will join the military after October 1 of this year, the beginning of the fiscal year 1986.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY].

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

I am fearful that this might have an adverse effect on new recruits coming in. They will not know what their retirement system will look like. Why would they join the military?

One of the incentives traditionally to bring people into the military was the retirement system.

Now, understand, I believe we have to correct the retirement system, but I believe very strongly we should make the correction before we make the financial deduction, because as I said, we have an established track record in this area and it is one that does not show well for this body.

So I would hope that the members of the full committee will look at that particular area of the budget and be careful when they cast their votes pertaining to it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the DOD authorization bill reported out by the Armed Services Committee.

I particularly want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY] for his fine remarks that he just made and I concur with those.

I want to commend our committee chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LES ASPIN, the subcommittee chairman and the members who worked so hard, the members of the committee and especially the committee staff for their diligent and effective work which went on into the night and on weekends at some point in time.

Although, Mr. Chairman, we waited patiently for a recommendation from our colleagues on the House Budget Committee, we did not receive one in time for our markup, which in effect to me indicates a serious need to rework, update and streamline the budgetary process; so we chose our own target of no real growth for defense, and we met it.

Our bill cuts \$18.5 billion from the administration request, and actually terminates 30 procurement programs.

Mr. Chairman, overall, in addition to allowing no real growth, we have actually cut weapons system procurement by 2 percent.

Although I don't agree with every line of the committee bill, I think that we have not only cut to about the right level—I think we have cut the right things.

We resisted the temptation to place our cuts in the personnel and oper-

ations accounts—which have been the target of too many cuts in the past, because cutting those accounts results in instant savings in outlays—and that is good politics.

Instead, we protected those accounts and concentrated most of our cuts in the investment accounts—procurement and R&D.

I might add that seven of the nine weapons systems to which we added funds were earmarked for the National Guard and Reserve. Anyone who follows defense knows that the Pentagon always underfunds the Guard and Reserve because they know the Congress will bail them out.

There is a lot of talk on the floor, Mr. Chairman about the budget that will be recommended to us by our colleagues on the House Budget Committee, and much of it troubles me.

I hear, for example that they may recommend a nominal freeze for defense—which allows no growth for inflation—and that they will then ask for \$8 billion in cuts below that.

They want to do this at the same time they are leaving social security COLA's, revenue sharing, UDAG grants, and many other domestic programs untouched.

Mr. Chairman I think the key to responsible cuts in spending is balance. We have to be fair. We cannot load all the cuts on those forces which are responsible for defending our freedom any more than we can ask the domestic programs to accept them all.

I have said on past occasions that I might be willing to accept a nominal freeze in defense. But I would only do this if that same nominal freeze was applied to every other spending program, and some program eliminations were added on top of that.

I recently had the high honor of being invited to speak before a group of internal defense auditors. These are knowledgeable people who serve on the front line in our war against the deficit.

In those remarks, I indicated that Americans are willing to pay for a strong defense if they believe there is a credible reason for doing so. I still believe that.

In order to maintain that credibility, Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to have to take a hard look at the way we are doing business in defense today. Recent headlines cry out for reforms in some of our procurement practices—and those reforms are needed. We are taking a look at this issue on the Armed Services Committee at the present time.

I think we are going to have to work hard to make sure that we are completely costing out all the programs that are being created. Whenever we start up a new weapons system, we are going to have to make sure that we realize how many troops will be needed

to support it, what the spare parts requirement will be and what we will need in the way of military construction.

If we don't we will be building a hidden overhead into these systems that may cause them not to be supported as they should be in the years to come.

Our budget problems are not going away, Mr. Chairman. The "good old days" are gone forever—in defense, as well as in every other area of Federal spending.

Those of us in this body are going to have to have the political courage to make sure that we pay for every bit of government that we are giving the people. If we can't afford it, we are going to have to be brave enough to say so. If we aren't our children will pay a high, high price for our failure to do our duty.

The House Armed Services Committee has reported out a good budget to you, ladies and gentlemen. I hope you will resist the temptation to play politics with it.

Mr. Chairman, I insert into the RECORD the complete text of the speech that I made before the internal auditors:

DEFENSE BALANCE SHEET—BLACK INK WANTED
(By Congressman Richard Ray)

I feel extremely fortunate to have this opportunity to speak to you.

Just about any time we converse or gather in these times, it doesn't take very long for us to begin discussing the problems of America.

I'm going to touch on one of my major concerns today, which is the cost of our Defense Program, but first, I want to comment on "what's right about America". Too often, we get so wrapped up in obstacles and problems and fears about the prospects for the future that we lose sight of what we really have.

I'm proud to be an American and we can be grateful for the heritage which our forefathers left us. The philosophy and achievements of those great leaders built our country, and thousands of Americans have died to guarantee that we can continue to live under those principles.

As Americans, we have the freedom to say what we think, to condemn the Government without fear of being hauled away in the middle of the night to prison as happens in many countries, to worship as we please, to enter into the free enterprise system and to succeed or to fail.

We can vote into or out of office representatives of Government without fear of reprisal, and we only have to watch the evening news to realize its not that way in many areas of the world.

My friends, there are many countries in this world who have lost these rights, and we have to remember that ours did not come to our forefathers without risk and must never be taken for granted.

One of the first things that I learned after being sworn into office was that the Congress is a deliberative body with highly diffused power. It's very difficult to get the 435 Members of the House of Representatives together on major issues, some which are critical to the well being of America.

Congress often times focuses too much on flash points or headlines and it gets overly preoccupied with reelection, particularly during election years. Sometimes, this preoccupation reaches the point that being re-elected overshadows the reason for being elected.

We are enamored with our importance and I am reminded of former Congressman Charlie Crisp, from my district in Georgia. [Joke.]

I always try to keep in mind that we were elected to serve the constituency and to legislatively serve the best interests of the country.

Despite the problems that we all complain about, the checks and balances system which our Founding Fathers developed does work to our best interest.

As Winston Churchill said in 1947: "... democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

However, as great as our form of government is, I agree with the French writer, De Tocqueville who said:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers—and it was not there . . . in her fertile fields and boundless forests—and it was not there . . . in her rich mines and her vast world commerce—and it was not there . . . in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution—and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

As I mentioned earlier, we worry in America about a number of things, such as health care, the aged population, our agriculture, the unemployed, the deterioration of the moral fiber of America, the national debt and other quality of life issues.

These things are important to us all, but I would imagine that if you asked the people of Afghanistan, or Poland, or Hungary which was more important, these items or their independence and freedom, they would tell you that nothing is more precious than the freedom to govern themselves.

I will tell you today that we do have many concerns, but they are secondary to the threat that America—sometime in the future—might not have the ability to deter aggression. Without a strong defense, we might be intimidated or forced into a neutral posture where we would not be in a position to help the free world remain free, or to remain free ourselves.

Therefore it goes without question that America must have a strong, reasonable and affordable defense.

I want to discuss with you my views on the cost of such a defense.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am strongly pro defense, and am even considered to be hawkish to some degree.

Maintaining a strong defense does not mean matching the Russians gun for gun, bullet for bullet, or soldier for soldier. It does mean that we have to stay on the cutting edge of technology and we have to be better.

It also means that we must update, rework and reorganize our procurement and accounting procedures—as well as weeding out those programs which have outgrown their usefulness.

In my opinion, we are going to have to take a close look at the procedures and prac-

tices we use to purchase our weapons and equipment, and the investments that we are making in military construction. I am afraid that we may be confronting some serious problems in the capital accounts area of the Defense budget as well as the operating and maintenance account.

While I am no expert in this area, I do sit on the Procurement Subcommittee, and I recognize that the \$292 billion Defense budget we had in fiscal year 1985 represented the largest single part of our overall budget for that year (26 percent). These expenditures mean that Defense carries an enormous inventory of goods and services.

All this means that even a small error in calculation or projection can turn into a billion dollar problem in the years ahead.

Later on in my remarks, I am going to deal with our huge national debt and what it means for all of us. But, for the moment, just let me say that all areas of government are going to have to learn to live within their means, and this includes Defense.

This means that we are going to have to start making affordable and common sense purchases, control our overhead, and utilize dependable accounting systems and procedures.

But I am afraid that as we begin to realize the overhead and costs that we are building into the next ten years and thereafter—a time when we are going to be trying to pay down our huge national debt—it is going to become clear that we are creating a dangerous situation for ourselves with overhead which is resembling more and more entitlement programs.

As accountants, you are all aware of the cost of debt servicing, and I know that you share my concern over the fact that interest on the national debt, alone, amounted to 104 billion dollars last year.

I believe that the principles of our monetary system which has worked well through the years, and which must fund the defense budget, is in jeopardy.

Presently we owe an enormous national debt:

A debt which from George Washington to Jimmy Carter accumulated to the staggering sum of \$906 billion.

A debt which has almost doubled in the last four years.

A debt which carries an interest bill of 13 cents on each tax dollar for 1984 (104 billion dollars) and will go to 15 cents by 1986.

Our philosophy of spending more than our income, year after year, having paid our operating expenses no more than ten times since 1924, threatens to drown us in a sea of red ink.

This practice threatens our entire system and especially our Defense Program.

Our defense cost is 28 percent of our overall budget in fiscal year 1986, and 6.8 percent of our GNP. This represents a request by the administration for 322.2 billion dollars, but is not likely to be funded in that amount by the Congress.

Americans are willing to pay for defense when they believe that we have a credible reason for doing so. For example, at the peak of defense spending during World War II, we spent as much as 89.5 percent of our budget dollars on defense.

There are many people in this country who believe that to spend 28 percent of our overall budget on defense, while borrowing 23 percent, in order to fund the deficit, doesn't make sense, particularly when cuts may be made in programs that determine our quality of life such as health care, education and social security.

The storm of criticism which has surrounded our defense industry because of overpricing of spare parts and military equipment, purchasing practices and overhead padding, has not done much to generate support from the American people. They tend to think that where there is this much smoke, there is bound to be a little fire.

Another concern is defense planning. As we look at our world wide strategy for the future, the cost of future overhead simply boggles the mind.

Let me give you an example of just one of those commitments. For the past 40 years, we have made a substantial commitment to NATO, and that commitment has resulted in the freedom of Europe for that period of time.

But that commitment has not been a cheap one. At the present time, we have more than 320,000 troops stationed in Europe, and our NATO commitment costs us around \$90 billion per year.

In addition to commitments like this, we are building in an overhead in the form of long term leases and military construction projects which will last well into the next century.

Defense "experts" are beginning to question our overall defense strategy, particularly in the areas of readiness, affordability, and the ability to make it work.

This strategy dictates that we procure the manpower, weapons and support capability necessary to wage simultaneous war along three fronts . . . NATO, Southeast Asia and Southwest Asia.

It is enormously expensive to create that capability. But when you think about the costs involved in sustaining it for years into the future, you are talking about some really frightening numbers.

For the past four years, we have been building toward that capability. In fact our procurement account has grown by 61 percent during that time frame.

Many observers of the defense scene are now questioning whether we have spent these dollars in a prudent way and gotten the maximum benefit out of them.

There are some who say that we purchased too many highly sophisticated systems too quickly. Then when it became apparent that we were not going to be able to generate the budget dollars that it would take to keep all these programs moving ahead at full throttle, DOD responded by stretching many of them out.

As all of you know, when DOD enters into a contract, they project the number of years that it will take to move through research and development to the end of the production cycle. Overhead and production costs are then estimated on the basis of those projections, and this leads us to a number which represents a unit cost for each of the weapons which will be produced.

The explosion of new programs which I mentioned earlier has forced DOD to stretch out 47 of their programs.

This practice has a serious effect on unit costs.

When a defense contractor builds fewer units than he had planned during a year, his unit costs have to go up, because his overhead costs are going to remain the same.

So it is safe to say that the closer a plant comes to operating at 100 percent capacity, the lower the unit costs are going to be.

I mentioned earlier that 47 programs have been stretched out. In those programs which belong to the Navy, the plants affect-

ed are currently operating at 38 percent of capacity; the plants which are producing the Air Force programs are at 58 percent, and the Army plants are at 72 percent.

This means that unit costs in all of these programs are going to be higher, and the total cost of each of these programs will therefore exceed those that were planned. In short, stretching out is false economy.

So we have to operate within sound business principles so as to avoid this type of situation.

This probably means that we are going to be faced with the unpleasant alternative of cancelling some programs.

Over the past few years, Congress has reacted to the criticism that has erupted over some of the DOD procurement practices by passing complicated laws which have resulted in huge stacks of regulations. This effort was well-intentioned, but I am convinced that in some cases it has made things worse rather than better. In fact, I am told that some of our procurement regulations are thicker and more complicated than those which are put out by IRS.

Complying with these regulations, of course, requires more manpower and hamstrings rapid and orderly procurement. It also takes the actual operation of these processes out of the hands of those who are supposed to be the experts.

Whether we like it or not, the harsh realities of America's deficit are going to have a permanent effect on defense spending. Those of us who support a strong defense are going to need to take the lead in arriving at responsible measures which are so desperately needed.

I don't pretend to have all the answers. But I do have some suggestions that I would like to share with you today.

First, I think we are going to have to do something which will be taken as a clear signal that we are resolved to do something about the situation . . . not only next year, but for the years to come.

I think we should give serious consideration to a spending blueprint which would cut out all real growth in defense for the next three fiscal years. Increases during that period would be limited to inflation, alone.

All of us know that defense spending has a long pipeline. This size of this year's outlays was determined by decisions which were made several years ago. So we have to undertake a steady and predictable policy which will have a meaningful effect on that pipeline.

Secondly, I think we are going to have to undertake a serious program that will take some meaningful looks at our procurement practices.

The House Armed Services Committee is already considering several such proposals. I think you will see some changes made in the expenses which have been allowed, in the past, to be charged off as costs, which is receiving so much criticism in the press and particularly in the Energy and Commerce hearings which Congressman Dingell is conducting.

The committee may take a look at the so-called, "revolving door" and enact some restrictions which make it harder for people who have played a meaningful part in the procurement process to move right out of Government service and get jobs with the private firms they were dealing with as Government employees.

The House Armed Services Committee is conducting random audits presently of the costs submitted by seven firms, and I expect

that this will occur more frequently in the future.

I am not necessarily suggesting that these are the exact reforms we need. But I don't think the public has a lot of confidence in the way we procure our defense systems, and I think we are going to have to take the steps that are necessary to restore that confidence.

One of the things which encourages me is the practice which has recently developed in the Armed Services of paying incentive bonuses to employees who come up with innovative ideas to increase efficiency and save the taxpayers money. We should encourage and recognize that this is a helpful program and accelerate it.

At the same time, we must consider penalties to confront practices which lead to waste and mismanagement.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, we need to realize that there is a substantial gap between our mission and our ability to meet that mission. In the past, we have drawn up missions which we knew would be difficult to accomplish, perhaps hoping that defining the mission will help generate the necessary funds.

Please don't misunderstand me. I believe the threat has to be the single force which determines the size of our commitment to defense. But once we have defined the threat, we should not lay out missions unless we have and are prepared to commit the resources to accomplish them.

In closing, let me say that it is always easier to identify a problem than it is to suggest the solutions.

But in this case, it is crucial that all those who play an important part in the military, the Congress and the defense industry realize that the country simply cannot afford business as usual.

Many of you in this room are already playing a key role in this whole process. It is you who help to assure that programs in defense and other Government activities are effectively and efficiently executed. I commend you for your efforts.

I understand that the defense internal audit and review groups have submitted recommendations identifying \$2.7 billion in savings during fiscal year 1984.

Notwithstanding these good efforts, many opportunities remain for auditors to help their parent organizations make more efficient use of the resources they have been provided.

There are no easy ways to go, but there is no doubt in my mind that we can do it. I am not in a senior leadership position on the committee, but I promise you that I am going to exert my total efforts toward devising and implementing a defense program that will keep us free without crushing us under a rapidly growing overhead that we cannot afford.

I will do this not because I am anti-defense, but because I am strongly pro-defense. If the friends of defense don't take the lead in this effort, it will only be a question of time before the effort will be undertaken and completed by others. And that would be a sad day for this country.

I want to thank you for the privilege of speaking before you. Those of you in this room have the expertise that we are going to have to rely on heavily during the coming years. But working together we can and must accomplish our goal.

□ 1510

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, our next speaker is the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] who was the anchorman on the committee and is a very capable freshman Member. I yield the gentleman 6 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thank the acting chairman of our committee and the ranking minority member.

Before I start into my brief presentation with reference to the chemical warfare deterrent today, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and all of my fine colleagues that serve on the Armed Services Committee. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] observed, I am only a freshman but I can stand here with pride today that we have provided the leadership that this House has long needed to start the process of reducing the enormous Federal deficit that we have in this Government.

It really does bother me that some are talking about they are going to amend our bill. I would like to remind them that we started out with the possibilities of a 5.6-percent real growth increase. We whittled that down to 3 percent and now we are down to a freeze. I think that we have done our part and now it is time for others to do their part.

I rise briefly today to address our authorization of \$1.275 million for the Chemical Retaliatory Stockpile Modernization Program, better known to some of the liberals and some of the liberal editorial writers as the great nerve gas controversy, including what they call the Bigeye bomb which opens up their eyes very widely each time we present this.

But I am going to avoid demagoguing on this issue because I think we should address the basic facts. The facts are that out of his money 74 percent of these funds or \$936 million will be used for protective measures. Yes, my colleagues, for protective measures. For the modernization of our chemical retaliatory capabilities we will use 16 percent or \$207 million. And for the demilitarization of the stockpile of unitary weapons we will use 10 percent or \$132 million.

The modernization program includes funding for binary munitions to complete facilities for the Bigeye bomb, to start procurement of both the M687GB2, 155 millimeter artillery projectile, and the Bigeye and continued research, development, test and evaluation of the XM135BC with multiple launch rocket system projectile.

I say all of that because most that argue against chemical warfare do not know what they are talking about. They read some of the more liberal editorials in this country, and if the editorial writers, who put out far more dangerous gas than what we are put-

ting out, say that they ought to come down here and demagogue and vote against chemical warfare deterrent, then they should go down and do it, and I say that that is absolutely wrong. In fact, this administration maintains that the present chemical munitions stockpile is inadequate, and I happen to agree with that, and that binary munitions must be produced.

Testimony provided to the committee overwhelmingly supports this position.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues that history has demonstrated that nations whose military forces possessed the ability to function while under chemical attack and retaliate in kind are less likely to experience such an attack.

I would like to say, unlike my predecessor who was one of the leading opponents of chemical warfare, I intend to be one of the leading proponents and I have a stack of facts, not rhetoric. I am not demagoguing, but I stand here to let my colleagues know, and all you liberal editorial writers, including probably some in my own home town of Little Rock, AR, that you had better have your facts together when you come down here under the 5-minute rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in closing for our side with a few areas that I think we have missed covering in the dialog we have had today. We have talked about reductions, we have talked about increases, we have talked about freeze, we have talked about real growth, and I think we also have to look at a commitment we have made to those in our military. And one of the accounts that has not been discussed too much is the \$4 billion that has been cut out of the retirement account.

I think this is an area that the Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee debated long and hard and felt very strongly that there should be some cuts in that area because we were cutting in all other areas.

I also feel very strongly that the commitment that we made to our military several years ago when addressing the retention problem, and addressing the military pay problem, addressing the equipment problem and the spare parts problem, has turned around a situation that we found to be very, very difficult at that time in the security and our national defense.

□ 1520

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. BYRON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation and compliment our chairman Mr. ASPIN on his leadership. However, we must recognize that the overall budget climate has constrained the level of funding for the DOD and DOE defense programs severely and the recent Senate budget action has further precluded the possibility for any real growth in defense spending for fiscal year 1986. The committee has done the best job it can to provide a bill that has good prospects of getting through the House. We must recognize that we are challenged by the required allocation of resources. The significant cut from the Reagan request should not be misinterpreted by friend or foe alike. We still intend to meet strategic and conventional threats to our national security, but the DOE planners must recognize that that period of significant real growth is over.

This budget cycle has provided the House Armed Services Committee a real opportunity to begin to rationally shape defense policy. I am particularly pleased at the committee report language on deterrence policy, including discussion of strategic modernization and the strategic defense initiative [SDI]. We have a pressing responsibility to catalyze the DOD to improve procurement practices drastically to avoid unwarranted contract charges and to improve quality assurance.

The RDT&E budget is clearly a key to ultimate control of the procurement process. While I do not support the extensive cuts in the RDT&E programs or the specific nature of certain cuts such as in SDI, I do support this principle. We must avoid premature introduction of weapons systems into the procurement cycle, when they have not undergone sufficient test and evaluation. I also believe that it is important to recognize the committee's concern about the Navy procurement getting out of phase with Navy requirements so that the projected naval aircraft mix simply does not make sense. I am sympathetic to the Air Force's critical needs to modernize its tactical aircraft wings as rapidly as possible, but the cost of the F-15 and F-16 appear to be too great to allow the type of real growth the Air Force needs to meet their rather ambitious timetable.

In the area of procurement, I could go so far as to say that I hope that the committee will consider a 3-year authorization of all programs, since DOD requires many multiyear procurements. This approach would free up the committee members and staff for extensive oversight activity rather than tying them down to an open-ended budget process, year in and year out.

I have been a strong supporter of the SDI Program since its inception and I still believe that it has the potential of serving to reduce the number of offensive weapons. I find some of the scientific community's technological pessimism to be rather surprising, but in many instances the underlying concern seems to be that the program itself raises questions about the merits of the United States staying wed to the MAD doctrine. I am very familiar with the space power requirements for SDI systems and I am very concerned about what a 30-percent cut would do to DOD efforts on multimegawatt systems. I hope that the SDI cuts can be adjusted in conference so that the authorization bill does not preclude the possibility of achievement of solid milestones in the next several years. I do not believe that we should get into splitting hairs of definitions such as the term "development" with respect to SDI. I am pleased that the committee has sustained the procurement of F-15E's and hope that the supporting funds for Lantirn testing are restored to a level that allows this promising system to stay on course. I have a particular concern about the Navy RDT&E program and believe that if the SSN-21 activity is in any way representative these programs require additional scrutiny. The absence of competitive procurement for the SSN-21 may be just the "tip of the iceberg" in terms of the policy thrust of Navy RDT&E.

The DOE National Security Program companion measure, H.R. 1873, has been incorporated in this defense programs bill as title IV. All seven programs under the DOE defense function will receive measureable growth, even though the overall request was reduced by \$240 million. I have a keen Member interest in the community assistance provisions under weapons activities and was pleased that the subcommittee accepted my amendment to restore the funding for Oak Ridge assistance payments, which had been included in the DOE request as a one time, final liquidation of the Department's program. I have been most supportive of the unique DOE national laboratory role in SDI because they bring unparalleled R&D skills to this important strategic program. However, I do partly share my colleague's, Mr. FOGLIETTA, concern in that I do believe x ray laser systems should be a last resort tool for SDI. The "pop-up" aspects of these systems make their timely use a technological challenge and regardless of semantic arguments, these systems will be viewed as nuclear weapons drive, not simply nuclear powered. The SDI Program cannot afford the negative perception that will result from a thrust on developing nuclear weapons for space-based purposes, albeit defensive in nature.

I am pleased the committee has recognized the potential role which the Oak Ridge National Laboratory might play in the SDI Program through DOE because of its strong strength in basic science and energy storage systems, which in turn complements the DOE role in space nuclear power.

I am pleased that the DOE request for continued enhancement of environmental programs and safeguards activities at weapons facilities are being supported. I share the committee's concern which prompted the restoration of significant funding for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program which still offers a unique route to weapons simulation data, as well as potential prospects for civilian power applications. The Special Isotope Separation Program, which is a companion to the civilian AVLIS Program authorized by my ERP Subcommittee, is also deserving of the recommended funding.

Under the pressing budget circumstances, the committee has done a very good job of reallocating resources. I will strongly support the committee to hold the line on the budget levels in this bill. The bill suggests some policy directions with which I am not in complete agreement. However, these are minor compared to the need to set priorities within a rational spending cap, something the administration has simply refused to do.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, it is never easy, when we are looking at a defense authorization bill and we are trying to put it into a proper perspective, to put it into proper guidelines that we get from the Committee on the Budget. This year we did not have the guidelines from the Committee on the Budget to work with. Yet we had a responsibility to make our cuts; 19.6 billion dollars' worth of cuts from the initial \$322 billion request.

So what we have done in the retirement account by cutting that \$4 billion, we have put the emphasis right back into the Department of Defense. It is going to be their responsibility to find out where those cuts are going to be made. It concerns me because I am worried about the retention issue which we have turned around; it concerns me because I am worried about the quality of our military which we have seen grow by leaps and bounds over the last few years.

I just want to say that I certainly hope in this day and age because of the constraints, financial constraints that we are not going to lose that edge that we have in moving forward for our national defense.

So as we close with a discussion and a dialog on the defense authorization bill today, we have had some hard choices to make. It has not always been our choice.

In the case of the Retirement Program we have put it back in the Department of Defense. Time and time again when the Pentagon comes over and testifies and you ask any of the individuals services: "If we have to cut a program, what program should we cut," I have never yet heard them say there is one program that needed to be cut.

Yet we found in cases this year 19.6 billion dollars' worth of cuts that we feel as a committee can be made without jeopardizing our national defense.

So I urge my colleagues when we come to the floor next week and on final passage of this bill to take into consideration the enormous amount of work that has gone into this bill, the enormous amount of work and consideration that the Committee on Armed Services has done in marking up this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear today with our chairman before the House in support of H.R. 1872, the Department of Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1986.

As many of my colleagues know, the administration submitted a request that would have supported almost 6 percent real growth in defense. However, they said on economic factors and the situation as it exists politically in this body, it was felt by the members of the committee that we were going to have to reduce this amount, which we did.

As has been pointed out by previous speakers, instead of a 6-percent real growth we felt that 3 percent real growth might be doable, at least the Senate did, and we went along with that concept. Then, in talking to our colleagues, particularly those on the Committee on the Budget, we realized that in today's political atmosphere and with the constraints we were faced with, probably zero percent plus inflation was a doable figure insofar as the House is concerned. Then we would have the opportunity of going into conference with the Senate with them at a higher figure and working some compromise between our low figure and their higher figure.

Then I was surprised, after we finished marking up our bill, the Senate announced they were going to undo their agreement and that the Committee on the Budget in the other body were going to mark to the same figure that the House had marked to, which is zero percent growth plus inflation. That hardly gives us any wiggle room in our conference with the Senate.

So these are some of the facts of life.

Now I understand that our Budget Committee is probably going to recom-

mend zero percent growth and zero percent inflation. So we are really between a rock and a hard place insofar as our recommendations of the committee to this House, and what we will be able to get from the Senate.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman from Alabama yielding me some time, and I will be very brief and would look forward to further discussion as the bill moves through the Congress.

I want to say initially, Mr. Chairman, that I was one who went to Mr. DICKINSON and even Chairman ASPIN early on and said that I thought that we needed to reduce the defense budget. I've served for 2 years on the Armed Services Committee where we have, to the largest degree, met the requests and demands of the Pentagon. So I am excited, and I think the committee and the Congress ought to be excited because on the committee cut \$18 billion from that Pentagon request with some true military reform. That included the elimination of TACAMO, which will save us probably several billion dollars, Mr. STRATTON's amendment; the PC-3, the AMRAAM Program, we fenced in money on the controversial DIVAD Program, we fenced in money on the Aquila, we changed the Lantirn Program, we made changes in the research development and testing, which would otherwise have received a 100-percent increase. We reduced that dramatically. We addressed the retirement program.

There is a new era in the Committee on Armed Services. We addressed this budget as true military reformers, from that person who has been in Congress for 30 years all the way down to the new freshman.

We have brought in a budget that is lean, tight, and well-thought through. I have to give credit to the chairman, Mr. ASPIN, because he provided the direction, with Mr. DICKINSON, the ranking minority member. We did not take any guff from anybody. We did not accept all the numbers or all the figures from any of the so-called experts. We looked at them all and we made some hard, tough decisions that brought us \$18 billion in deficit reductions. That's 3 percent less than what Walter Mondale said we needed and 6 percent less than what this President said we needed.

We have made a contribution. Remember, John Kennedy spent 50 percent of our national budget on defense, and this President is spending 26 percent. In GNP terms we are at about 6.6 percent of GNP as compared to nondefense areas of 15 percent.

For those people who want to go less than a zero percent increase, I tell them: "You come in and tell us where.

Don't come in and give us some bland budget figure. You tell us where you are going to take the money." From 1977 to 1983 the Soviets built 15,000 tanks, we built 5,000; they built 5,000 fighter aircraft, we built 3,000. In the same period of 1977 to 1983 they built 1,500 ICBM's to our several hundred.

In bombers, they built 250 strategic bombers, we had none.

If you want to save money, tell us where you are going to save it, tell us the programs where we are going to go. We have addressed personnel, we have addressed the conventional systems, we have reformed them like military reformers want us to do. We have report language that makes procurement more competitive. We saved \$18 billion, a responsible contribution to the budget deficit reduction program.

So I think we should be proud of what the Committee on Armed Services did because it is revolutionary, considering where we have been. We ought to feel good about it. I am excited about it, and I think my constituents are, Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for his observations, Mr. Chairman. I think he makes a very good and telling point.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I, too, am pleased with what our committee was willing to do, what we did. I do not think there was anybody on the committee that was satisfied that we had done as much as we should. I think in bowing to reality we recognized what we could do and within the parameters of the framework of what we could get funded on the floor we did a very prudent and responsible job.

The question is, Do we really need this much defense? What is our adversary doing, our potential adversary? Is there really a threat out there? Or are we just rattling sabers, hearing a drumbeat that really does not exist? Are we really just priming the pump for something for which there is no real genuine need?

Mr. Chairman, last year at this time during floor debate I stated that the Soviets had deployed 378 SS-20 missiles.

Now, an SS-20 is an intermediate range ballistic missile with three warheads with a range of 5,000 kilometers approximately.

□ 1530

At that time, I said they had deployed 378, keeping in mind that each one has one backup; they come in pairs.

Well, today instead of a freeze by the Soviet Union, today they have deployed 414. It is amusing that a year or so ago I met with the other members of our Committee on Armed Services with our counterparts from the Euro-

pean community, the North Atlantic Assembly. We meet over there once a year; they come over and meet with us once a year, and they are parliamentarians from Great Britain; some from France, occasionally from the Netherlands, from Belgium, from Germany.

So we were sitting around the table talking and one of our colleagues said: "Well, why don't you negotiate with the Russians? Why don't we just have a freeze and negotiate?"

Peter Peterson, who is in the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany said, "Congressman, we do negotiate. In 1978 we negotiated and debated with the Soviets, and they deployed. In 1979 we debated, and they deployed. In 1980 we debated, and they deployed. And we have not deployed one single nuclear system until this year"—talking about the Pershing and the GLCM—"and all the time we were debating they were deploying at the rate of one per week since 1977, to the point where today they have over 400 of them in place, and we are still debating."

The same is true with the MX. We have the Minuteman III; this is our last ICBM. Since then the Soviets have built and deployed two new systems, and we're still debating the MX. We start off asking for 200 MX, now we've cut it to 100, now in this budget cycle instead of the 48 requested, we have recommended 21. I think we will be doing well in the final analysis if we get half of the 100 that was already agreed to.

So whether we are talking about the B1—we started out to build 200 of those and now we say we will build 100; we say we were going to build 200 MX, now we are going to build perhaps 50. We are going to build—all the weapons systems that have started out to build, we keep building less and less and funding it less and less, and I think it is time that the American people recognize that we are not crying wolf; there is a potential adversary there that is very technically efficient, that is very well armed, and who means us no good will at all.

If he, the potential adversary, was sincere, he would be building defensive weapons, not offensive. If we look at the buildup he has of the intercontinental ballistic missiles, of the intermediate range ballistic missiles he is deploying on a regular basis; he is building newer and modern and more intercontinental bombers.

So the nuclear subs he is building, they outbuild us in numbers and in size and in capability and performance quite often. So I think we are deluding ourselves to think that we have some great big, benign, charitable, potential adversary out there that really means us no harm, and all we need to do is sit down and talk with him, because if we are friendly he will be friendly in

return, and we do not have to worry about him doing us any harm in the future.

I think that is shortsighted, I think it is foolish. I think it is what we have offered here in terms of this year's House defense authorization bill is the minimum we should do, and I would certainly urge my colleagues to support it, and I would hope that the next time we get back to the floor to finish the debate on this, we would have more than seven Members present, all of whom belong on this committee, and no other Members in the Chamber, when we are discussing a bill that is close to \$300 billion, that has to do with the life and death of this country in the long run.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear today with our chairman of the committee to bring before the House H.R. 1872, the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986.

As many of my colleagues know, the administration submitted a defense request that would have supported almost 6 percent real growth in the defense accounts.

However, based on the economic situation, the committee felt that such a growth rate was unsupportable. In a more normal economic environment, that is about the correct rate of growth given the unrelenting Soviet military buildup.

But we felt that the defense sector should contribute its fair share to deficit reduction. Consequently, we have marked up and reported a bill that represents no real dollar growth over last year.

To meet this level, the defense authorization request was cut by \$14.3 billion. Further cuts in personnel, military construction, and defense programs in the Department of Energy resulted in total cuts of about \$19.6 billion.

This bill is a milestone of sorts for the country and the Congress. For the first time in 6 years we are recommending no growth in the rate of improvement for our Nation's defense forces.

I think it's worth noting some representative improvements that we have seen over the past few years in our defense force structure.

Since 1980 we have made remarkable progress in modernizing our forces and improving their readiness. Recruitment and retention are up. First quarter 1985 reenlistments rates are up 11 percent since 1980.

In the areas of readiness, our pilots are getting 30 percent more flying time than they were in 1980 and aircraft ready rates have improved 7 percent in that time. Munitions inventories have increased by an average of 39 percent across all four services. We are fielding more and better items equipment to our forces.

However, we recognized the probability of a budget resolution that would also recommend reduction of the President's request. Subsequently, most committee members agreed that zero percent real growth would preserve most of the defense improvements the Congress has approved to date.

The committee set some ground rules to guide us in our surgery: The initiation of new weapons systems was slowed by large cutbacks in research and development because every dollar spent on R&D generates \$3 to \$5 later in procurement; and operations and maintenance accounts were protected to the extent possible within the overall zero percent real growth level.

I want to hasten to add that I don't believe the threat to our security has lessened one iota. On the contrary, the Soviet Union continues to field massive amounts of military hardware. Let me cite a few examples:

Last year at this time during floor debate I stated the Soviets had deployed 378 SS-20 intermediate range ballistic missiles. This year now—today—they have 414 deployed—an increase of 108 warheads as each missile carries 3 warheads capable of a 3,000-mile range.

Many of us are aware of the recent test firing of the new SS-X-24 and SS-X-25 fifth generation Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Both systems are nearing deployment, with the SS-X-25 closest to operational capability.

Two ships of a new Delta IV class of ballistic missile submarines were launched.

Another Typhoon class ballistic missile submarine completed sea trials—making three of these subs now operational.

Blackjack strategic bombers were produced at a rate of 30 per year.

I could go on and on about Soviet deployments of large numbers of new weapons, but the point is I don't believe the threat has eased one bit.

To that end, we did fund many of the President's strategic programs at the levels he requested. Over \$5.8 billion is recommended for R&D and procurement of the last 48 B-1 aircraft. This has been an exceptionally well run Air Force program. It is coming in on cost and on schedule.

We are funding the Trident II missile system [D-5] for the Trident sub at \$2.6 billion.

The ground launched cruise missile [GLCM]—the system designed to deter the Soviets' massive force of SS-20's was funded at \$545 million for 95 missiles.

The committee believes strongly that we must develop a chemical weapon deterrent force. If we don't, we may open our forces to chemical strikes in future conflicts.

We have not produced chemical weapons for over 15 years while we have listened to the Soviets' propaganda and stalling tactics at the talks in Geneva. We have proposed a chemical warfare treaty with the Soviets, and they have not responded in a meaningful way.

History has demonstrated that only those nations with a strong chemical deterrent are least likely to experience a chemical attack.

We must provide our men in uniform a chemical weapon deterrent. To that end, this bill contains funding for the Big Eye chemical bomb and the 155-millimeter chemical artillery shell.

Let me now turn to the research and development portion of the bill. I serve as ranking member of that subcommittee.

The reduction of \$5 billion in research and development is the largest cut that our committee has ever recommended. I was not in total agreement with all of the specific reductions, but I do agree with the level that we have reduced. The committee recommendation of \$34 billion represents a \$3-billion increase over last year's level or a 4½-percent real growth in the account.

Congress has provided for major real increases in research and development every year since fiscal year 1980, primarily to make up for a 10-year period of no growth in this account. I believe we have reached the point where we cannot continue to make major increases in this area. We need to carefully examine the impact of the programs now in R&D on the future force structure. We clearly cannot afford to field them all. In the strategic area alone we have MX, Midgetman, Trident II [D-5], B-1, ATB, SRAM II, E-6A, advanced cruise missile, SDI and ASAT, all in R&D and all with a large price tag—over \$10 billion in fiscal year 1986. In tactical air we are doing major R&D on the ATF, ATA, F-15E, F-16F, F-14D, A-6E, C-17, JVTX, LHX, T-46, AV-8B and F/A-18—\$2.8 billion in fiscal year 1986.

I'd like to say we have put a significant dent in this problem, but the reality is that most of these programs have a very firm political life. The committee has eliminated a number of programs in research and development and made efficiency reductions in others.

The major research and development reduction made by the committee was in the strategic defense initiatives program. The committee, although it strongly supports the SDI Program, was not prepared to recommend the full authorization of \$3.7 billion requested by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986. Extensive debate occurred in the committee on the appropriate level of authorization for SDI.

The committee believes that major efficiency reductions can be made in the various program elements without seriously jeopardizing the overall SDI goals. The committee was not convinced that the 100- to 200-percent increases in many program elements could be efficiently accommodated. We believe that through better program definition and elimination of lower priority efforts, the \$1.24 billion overall reduction would not severely affect the SDI Program.

The committee did make some tough decisions and terminated over 30 programs.

One program that was recommended for termination was the advanced medium range air-to-air missile [AMRAAM]. The committee has closely followed the development cycle of this missile through special staff reviews and increased oversight. This year we concluded that the projected unit cost of the missile had increased by a factor of 3, and the schedule has slipped by almost 2 years. We felt that the system had become unaffordable.

In summary then, the committee was faced with a very difficult task of reducing the administration's request of almost 6 percent real growth down to zero percent.

We structured these reductions—to the extent possible—to protect the areas of readiness and force sustainability that the Congress has approved in the past.

I urge my colleagues to resist further cuts and to support this bill. To cut further would reverse the improvements the Congress has made in force modernization and readiness.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have remaining a minute and a half and yield myself the remaining time.

I would just like to join in seconding what Mr. DICKINSON has said. I think the committee has done an outstanding job in bringing this bill to the floor in this particular form.

At the beginning of the year, it was said that Defense would not contribute anything toward trying to eliminate the budget deficit. We have in fact in our committee initiated the effort, and we were the ones that brought down to the 1985 figures, and then the Senate, as Mr. DICKINSON has pointed out, came down to our figure.

As the gentleman from Alabama has pointed out, let us not forget that there is a threat, a serious threat; certainly the new leader of the Soviet Union has not indicated any particularly benign character, and I think we have got to keep our powder dry and we have got to continue to maintain a strong defense.

This is what we hope that the House, when we go back under the 5-minute rule, will support us on.

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the general intent of H.R. 1872, The Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. I continue to be firmly committed to the strengthening and modernization of our national defense capability—maintaining the security of our Nation is a primary responsibility that we, as Federal legislators, must fulfill. Over the past 4 years, I believe we have begun to make substantial progress toward overcoming deficiencies in our defense posture and redressing the strategic imbalance resulting from the long, and continuing, Soviet military buildup. This progress must not be jeopardized now; we must continue to provide the necessary resources for sustaining a strong and effective national defense.

Nevertheless, I recognize that one element of national security is a strong and stable economy—until we bring the Federal deficit firmly under control, we leave the Nation vulnerable to external pressures and weakened in its ability to respond to external threats. I therefore support many of the efforts made by the House Armed Services Committee to impose the same fiscal discipline on the defense budget as we must impose on all programs contained in the Federal budget. In my view, reduced defense expenditures as recommended in H.R. 1872 can serve as an important contribution to an overall deficit-reduction package encompassing all areas of Federal spending.

Still, as we attempt to trim waste, eliminate inefficiencies, and improve the cost effectiveness of the defense programs we pursue, it is vital, Mr. Chairman, that we not lose sight of the nature of the threat to which our Armed Forces must answer. The Soviet Union, in spite of a significant slowdown in economic growth in recent years, has consistently increased its spending for defense and now is reported to spend 15 to 17 percent of its GNP on the military sector. It has continued to modernize and expand its strategic forces, deploying new generations of nuclear missiles; it has developed an alarming chemical warfare capability and demonstrated it in Afghanistan; it is developing antisatellite weaponry and ballistic missile defense systems. These are the developments to which our defense budget must respond; if we are to preserve peace, we must maintain a credible deterrent.

In this respect, Mr. Chairman, I support provisions in H.R. 1872 to continue development of a small, mobile ICBM, to complete the procurement of 100 B-1 bombers, to acquire 23 new ships, including a Trident submarine, and to convert 5 others, and to provide funding for the procurement of binary chemical weapons which will replace the more dangerous and outdated

stockpile we currently maintain. Furthermore, despite substantial reductions in the funding for space defense research, the legislation before us still provides for a 75 percent increase over last year in funding for the SDI. In my view, this represents an increase which is consistent with both our determination and our ability to explore further the feasibility of developing defensive systems.

Mr. Chairman, while I remain concerned about certain economies made in this bill, particularly the authorization of only 21 MX missiles instead of the 48 requested by the President, I commend the Committee on Armed Services for its inclusion of provisions to address waste and inefficiency in defense procurement. By recommending that the Air Force initiate a competitive procurement program for tactical fighter aircraft and by placing performance conditions on the release of funds for the troubled DIVAD Program, I believe that H.R. 1872 builds on the positive procurement reforms begun during the 98th Congress and moves us closer to a competitive, cost-effective approach to defense procurement.

Overall, the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986 provides a reasonable balance of concern for fiscal restraint and recognition of security requirements. Even though the staggering Federal deficit demands our attention and influences every one of our budgetary decisions, we cannot forget that without a strong national defense we leave our freedom and security at risk. Our first priority must be to ensure a sound, solid and complete defense of our Nation. ●

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, when the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense authorization is considered on the House floor, Congressman COUGHLIN and I will offer an amendment to continue the limitation on antisatellite [ASAT] testing adopted by the House last year. The Brown-Coughlin amendment would again prohibit testing of the U.S. F-15-launched ASAT against an object in space as long as the Soviet Union does not conduct such a test. The amendment would not cut ASAT funding or prevent any tests other than tests against actual targets in space.

The arguments which persuaded the House to adopt the ASAT test ban last year by a substantial margin are as compelling today as they were then. The Soviet ASAT is crude and unreliable, and based on technology the United States abandoned many years ago. The Soviets have not tested their ASAT since 1982. The U.S. F-15 system, a generation beyond the Soviet ASAT, has been tested against points in space.

Testing of the U.S. ASAT against targets in space is now planned. The

Soviets are likely to respond to such tests by attempting to match our superior technology. Now is the time to negotiate an agreement to limit ASAT's before it is too late to avert a costly and destabilizing arms race in space.

Our most important military satellites are presently beyond Soviet ASAT range. Testing of this sophisticated weapon against space targets will lead to an unrestrained ASAT competition. Because the United States depends more heavily on satellites than the Soviet Union, our own national security interests would thus be best served by limiting the Soviet capability to destroy our satellites.

I urge the support of my colleagues for the Brown-Coughlin ASAT amendment.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The text of the amendment appears below:

**AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1872, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA**

At the end of title II (page 29, after line 14) add the following new sentence:

SEC. 207. LIMITATION ON TESTING OF ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS.

The Secretary of Defense may not carry out a test of the Space Defense System (antisatellite weapon) against an object in space until the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has conducted, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a test against an object in space of a dedicated antisatellite weapon. The prohibition in this section expires on October 1, 1986.

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, there may not be a more important authorization bill that we will be asked to consider in this Congress or indeed in any Congress. Not only must we authorize programs to build our national security, but we must also act immediately to halt reckless defense spending or share the blame for the state of this country's economy.

Mr. Chairman, I am beginning to feel like a broken record. In January 1983 I wrote in the New York Times that "large increases in defense spending are dangerous to the economy. They make it impossible to reduce the Federal Government's excessive deficits predicted for fiscal 1984 and 1985."

In May 1984 I stood on the floor of this House and stressed that "we have a grave duty in this year of a potential \$200 billion deficit to see that every dollar in the defense spending portion of the budget is spent wisely * * *. It is foolish to plunge ahead with unsustainable procurement programs, when we know that they are inevitably going to have to be stretched out, with higher per unit costs, so that ultimately we shall get fewer and fewer weapons at higher and higher costs."

But I am more optimistic this year; not optimistic that the Pentagon has seen the light but that my colleagues in this House have. I have heard many of you say, "Yes, this or that weapons system would be nice but we have to begin making choices." And I have

heard many of you using the words "defense freeze."

The alternatives are really not acceptable. If we don't start cutting the big ticket items—saying no to 48 or even 21 more MX missiles and no to any increase in star wars funding—we will continue to pay both in terms of defense readiness and the national economy. What that will mean is a continual black eye for the U.S. defense capabilities—such as we earned in Iran, in Lebanon, even in Grenada—and a possible return to the 1979 high inflation, high interest rate economy that we all remember.

We don't owe the Pentagon a blank check, we owe our constituencies a prudent defense program. We have a chance to deliver it by cutting responsibly on this DOD authorization.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ) having assumed the chair, Mr. OLIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1872) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the Armed Forces for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for working capital funds, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1872, the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GOOD ADVICE TO CONGRESS FROM ALABAMIANS

(Mr. ERDREICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of the first session of this 99th Congress, I asked the people of the Sixth District of Alabama, as I did during both sessions of the 98th Congress, to respond to my annual congressional questionnaire and share their opinions on two major priorities facing our Nation: deficit reduction and tax reform.

Almost 14,000 people took the time to answer the questionnaire, and I would like to thank them for their valuable input and share their views with my colleagues in Congress.

If there was one overriding message in the questionnaire responses I received, it was a demand for action in Congress to bring Federal spending under control and reduce the budget deficit that threatens to reverse the economic gains we have made. A strong majority made it clear that they were willing to accept a budget freeze in order to reduce the deficit.

Two-thirds of those who responded favored an across-the-board freeze on all Federal spending. As well, two-thirds supported a combination of restraint on all Federal spending and new tax increases to reduce the deficits. In addition, an overwhelming 89 percent supported a "pay-as-you-go" budget proposal that would require the Federal Government to pay—not borrow—for any spending above last year's level.

Those responding to my 1985 Congressional Questionnaire also felt strongly that the Tax Code should be restructured to make it less complex and fairer. While only 19 percent of respondents favored eliminating all tax deductions, an overwhelming 91 percent believed that the Tax Code should be reformed. Seventy-four percent believed that deductions for charitable contributions should be retained, and 85 percent supported retaining the deduction for home mortgage interest.

When asked their views on overall spending policies, over 60 percent of those responding believed that the current level of domestic spending was too much, while 84 percent felt that the current level of defense spending was either about right or too much.

Again, I would like to thank the almost 14,000 Jefferson County residents who answered my third annual congressional questionnaire. The opinions of the people of the Sixth District of Alabama are a valuable guide to me and the entire Congress as we face the tough choices that lie ahead. These opinions will help me do a better job of representing Jefferson County thinking in Washington.

The total "yes" and "no" response percentages on some questions do not equal 100 percent because a small number of respondents did not answer all the questions.

The questions included in the questionnaire and response percentages follow:

CONGRESSMAN BEN ERDREICH'S CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Federal deficit spending has grown dramatically since 1980. The budget chart below outlines the policies which have been in place since 1980 and is converted into 1984 dollars to give a picture of where the growth in spending has occurred. While

some \$50 billion has been cut from non-defense domestic programs, other areas grew. Further, the impact of the 1981 tax cut reduces federal revenues by \$117 billion in 1985 alone.

The President has submitted a budget to Congress that has a \$180 billion deficit. It reduces domestic spending by \$40 billion over last year, excluding Social Security, and increases defense spending by \$32 billion.

	Percentage	
	Yes	No
1. Do you agree with the Administration's proposal to reduce federal spending in all other areas except Social Security and Defense?	60	40
In order to further reduce the deficit, would you favor:		
2. A reduction in defense spending?	54	46
3. A freeze on Social Security?	49	51
4. Increasing costs to Medicare beneficiaries?	38	61
5. A combination of restraint on all Federal spending and new tax increases?	67	33
6. An across-the-board freeze on all Federal spending?	67	33
7. Would you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution requiring the Federal budget to be balanced except in times of national emergency?	84	16
8. Would you support a "pay-as-you-go" budget proposal that would require the Federal government to pay (not borrow) for any spending above last year's level?	89	11
The Department of the Treasury and a variety of national leaders have proposed a change in the way we pay our Federal income taxes. The Treasury plan would end many special tax preferences in order to reduce overall tax rates. An individual may lose a particular tax benefit under the plan, such as the deduction for state and local taxes, but that would be offset by a lower tax rate in most cases. Further, business taxes would be increased.		
9. Do you believe that the tax code should be reformed?	91	9
10. Do you believe that a new plan similar to the one proposed by the Treasury Department should be adopted?	64	33
11. If a new tax law were adopted, would you favor retaining the medical and dental tax deduction?	66	34
12. Do you believe that deductions for charitable contributions should be retained?	74	26
13. Would you favor retaining the deduction for home mortgage interest?	85	15
14. Should employer-provided benefits, such as health and life insurance and education benefits, be included as taxable income?	36	64
15. Should credit card and other interest deductions be retained?	51	49
16. Would you favor eliminating all tax deductions?	19	81
Take a moment to think about the Federal budget again and give me your thoughts on overall spending policies.		
17. Do you think the current level of domestic spending is: a. about right? 22%; b. too much? 62%; c. too little? 8%.		
18. Do you think the current level of defense spending is: a. about right? 42%; b. too much? 42%; c. too little? 8%.		

INJUSTICE TO INDIANA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

(Mr. COBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, lest anybody in this body think that the American people are going to quickly forget the injustice that has been done to the people of the Eighth District of Indiana, I bring to the House two recent editorials from local papers in North Carolina. I am going to read the opening and the closing paragraph of each and include the rest of the editorials in the RECORD.

The first is from the Durham Morning Herald, entitled "Congress Crushes Good Will."

The U.S. House of Representatives committed the unpardonable sin last week. It blasphemed Indiana's right to representative government of, for, and by the people.

In this case, rather than seating the certified loser, the House should have called for another election.

From the Courier-Tribune in Asheville, "What Good Did It Do?" is the title.

The Democrats have forced an illegal Representative down the throats of the people of Indiana's Eighth District.

The course for Republicans now is in the courts. They must demand a special election—it is the only proper thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to forget about this injustice.

The full editorials follow:

[From the Durham (NC) Morning Herald, May 5, 1985]

CONGRESS CRUSHES GOOD WILL

The U.S. House of Representatives committed the unpardonable sin last week. It blasphemed Indiana's right to representative government of, for and by the people.

In denying Indiana's certified election winner, Republican Richard D. McIntyre, his rightful seat in the House from the 8th District of Indiana, the Democratic majority crushed the good will and bipartisanship that Congress desperately needs.

The action made little sense. The recommendation of a task force that investigated the Indiana election results was blatantly biased. To assure that the Democratic candidate would win in the task force's recount, the Democrats simply refused to count all the ballots.

The Indiana election results are, indeed, confusing. The Democrat, Frank McCloskey, held a slim lead election night. Mr. McIntyre got the lead in a recount—first by a 34-vote margin, later by 418 votes. But the House refused to seat him.

Then the House appointed a three-member committee to recount the ballots. The committee's 2-1 Democratic majority decided that Mr. McCloskey won by four votes—the margin by which Mr. McCloskey was ahead when the count stopped.

In defense of the Democrats, there were questions about the absentee ballots that were not counted. Although postmarked before the election, they had arrived a week later. But there were other absentee ballots that had been counted that might have been questioned for the same reason.

Furthermore, there were precincts with more ballots than voters who signed the rolls. So the Indiana election, the closest House race this century, is suspect from either side.

The Constitution gives the House the right to refuse to seat a member—even if properly elected. But it has never before turned back the certified winner because a race was close.

In this case, rather than seating the certified loser, the House should have called for another election.

[From the Courier-Tribune (Asheboro, NC), May 3, 1985]

WHAT GOOD DID IT DO?

What good did it do?

The Democrats have forced an illegal representative down the throats of the people of Indiana's 8th District.

The end of the long battle climaxed with a brief walkout by Republican members of the U.S. House.

The Democrats have deprived people of the Hoosier State of their rightful lawmaker and have driven a wedge between themselves and the Republican minority that may not be removed for a long time. All for one lawmaker.

The infamous vote was 236-190, with 10 brave Democrats voting justly with the GOP.

One sad Republican noted "The Democrat majority was willing to exercise ruthlessly whatever power it has in sheer numbers."

What has happened to bipartisanship? What has happened to sound reasoning?

There was a time when lawmakers served their people before their party; they were citizens of their state before members of their party.

Is there no more room for compromise in the halls of Congress? What happened to just and honorable men?

The facts of this sad case have been stated over and over. Everyone knows of votes, recounts and thefts of votes.

What good has it done?

We do not blame Democrat Frank McCloskey for following the course of his party.

We feel for Republican Richard McIntyre who deserved and did not get an honest shake from the Democrat Party.

The course for Republicans now is in the courts. They must demand a special election—it is the only proper thing to do.—J.G.S.

DASH TO MANAGUA

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, there is an article by Evans and Novak entitled "Dash To Managua."

We have heard a great deal about the Democratic Party seeking to move back into the mainstream of American politics, seeking to recapture that center that wins Presidential elections, seeking to reestablish its links with the moderate Democratic South, Southwest, and West.

"Dash to Managua" has our colleagues, Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, essentially conducting foreign policy with the Marxist government of Nicaragua. It has two U.S. Congressmen, following on the heels of Ortega's trip to Moscow, going off to Managua to plead with the Sandinista government, essentially seeking a way out of their difficult political situation deriving from the vote in this House to give no assistance whatsoever to democratic forces in Nicaragua and the immediate departure of Mr. Ortega to Moscow to discuss a \$200 million Soviet aid package.

□ 1050

It says, the Evans and Novak article had "the Congressmen warning that unless the Nicaraguan Government

took steps toward pluralism, congressional Democrats would switch and vote aid for the Contras. It was a second such source that quoted the Congressmen asking the Sandinistas to 'help them out of a difficult political situation.'

Mr. Speaker, what in the world are U.S. Congressmen conducting personal foreign affairs with the Soviet-Cuban backed Marxist government of Nicaragua?

Mr. Speaker, I say, let us leave foreign policy to the Secretary of State.

The Evans and Novak editorial in today's Washington Post follows:

DASH TO MANAGUA

No sooner had President Daniel Ortega flown off to Moscow than two Democratic congressmen arrived in Managua for the weekend to plead, according to U.S. diplomatic cables, for help from the Marxist-Leninist regime in calming the congressional uproar over the Nicaraguan's telltale trip.

Reps. George Miller of California and David Bonior of Michigan say "no comment" on their "private conversations" with Sandinista leaders, from which U.S. Embassy officials were excluded. But cables reporting on their talks have surfaced on Capitol Hill, where we obtained them. They describe the congressmen as making the trip to "see what the [Nicaraguan] government could do to help them out of a difficult political situation in the House."

An unnamed member of the congressional delegation is quoted as advising Foreign Ministry officials that the regime should try and hold out for three more years because things back in Washington might radically change by then, meaning a new administration in power. Departing from his "no comment" rule, Miller told us that no such statements were made.

A House Democratic leader, who did not want his name used, said he was "uncomfortable" that their weekend in Managua brought Miller-Bonior "dangerously close to negotiations." But beyond the impropriety of congressmen playing diplomat is a grosser spectacle: a symbiotic relationship between American politicians and the Nicaraguan dictatorship.

Miller and Bonior dashed off to Managua as many Democratic colleagues fretted over Ortega's mission to Moscow immediately after the House vetoed any aid to anti-Sandinista guerrillas. Miller is one of the Nicaraguan regime's most energetic supporters in Congress. He was accompanied by a staffer, Cynthia Arnsen, a prominent champion of the Sandinistas, formerly employed by the left-wing Institute for Policy Studies.

The two congressmen were accorded less than red-carpet treatment. They were not satisfied by a session with Deputy Foreign Minister Victor Hugo Tinoco and failed to get an appointment with Interior Minister Tomas Borge. But they did meet Vice President Sergio Ramirez; Comandante Bayardo Arce, the regime's chief ideologist as coordinator of the Sandinista Political Committee, and Carlos Tunnermann, ambassador to the United States.

In a departure from tradition but true to the latest fashion of pro-Sandinista congressmen, U.S. Embassy officials were barred from the meetings. Miller informed the embassy he had told Ramirez the regime would have to ease censorship and allow what were termed democratic activi-

ties to keep the support of Democrats in Washington.

But reports from Nicaraguan sources, as reflected in cables being read on Capitol Hill, suggested the congressmen were less interested in liberalization for its own sake than in getting themselves off the political hook back home.

One well-placed source had the congressmen warning that unless the Nicaraguan government took steps toward pluralism, congressional Democrats would switch and vote aid for the Contras. It was a second such source that quoted the congressmen asking the Sandinistas to "help them out of a difficult political situation."

The one meeting embassy officials attended was with Jaime Chamorro, editor of the anti-Sandinista *La Prensa*. Miller told the embattled newspaperman that he had urged on government officials the necessity of freedom of the press. Chamorro was not impressed. *La Prensa* would not accept a separate agreement with the government, he said, insisting that freedom of the press must be part of a national "dialogue."

The Miller-Bonior weekend in Managua follows a pattern. When Democratic Sens. John Kerry of Massachusetts and Tom Harkin of Iowa conferred with Ortega in Managua before the House vote, they not only barred U.S. diplomats but did not even report to them after the fact, as Miller and Bonior did. The Sandinista regime's offer to send 100 (out of 2,000) Cubans back home followed secret negotiations not with U.S. diplomats but with congressional staffers.

The pattern may be breaking, partly because free-lance congressional diplomacy is stirring bipartisan distaste. Bernard Aronson, a Democratic insider and campaign adviser to Geraldine Ferraro last fall, writes in the current *New Republic* that his party should promise military support for the armed democratic resistance if all other efforts fail. That advice is the antithesis of Democrats, pursuing cosmetic Sandinista "pluralism" while urging the comandantes to hang tough until the next American presidential election.

□ 1540

THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, because the Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, was involved in a very important mark last week, I was unable to participate in the special orders held by the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA and Mr. PICKLE] to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration. Consequently, I would like to take this opportunity today to say a few words about this important program.

Last Saturday, May 11, marked the 50th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's signing of the Executive order creating the Rural Electrification Administration. That signing was celebrated at the Little White House in Warm Springs, GA, last Saturday. One year and ten days after the origi-

nal order was signed, on May 21, 1936, the Rural Electrification Act was signed into law, giving the REA full status as a Federal agency.

To many, this may have seemed like the creation of just another Federal agency, but it was actually much, much more. As a boy growing up on a dairy farm in rural Hancock County, GA, I saw first hand the benefits which electricity brought to rural America. My family was a member of the Washington Electric Membership Corp. and the electric power we received ran not only lights but water pumps, electric milkers, radios, and television. Quite literally, it afforded us the opportunity to be part of the 20th century.

Today, those who live in rural areas are able to enjoy the same benefits as those who live in cities because of the REA and electric membership corporations [EMC's], a primary user of REA financing. The Georgia EMC has more customers than any other State, and the two largest EMC's in Georgia—Cobb EMC with more than 65,000 customers and North Georgia EMC with almost 60,000 customers—are located in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the two EMC's, their general managers—Paul Weatherby of Cobb EMC and Elvin Farrar of the North Georgia EMC—and all of their employees for the service which they perform for the people of the Seventh District. I also want to point out, especially at this time when Congress is reevaluating so many programs that are not working, that the REA is one program which has helped people help themselves as Atlanta Journal editorial page editor, Durwood McAlister, wrote in a column entitled "REA Was Different; A Partner, Not a Handout."

Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. McAlister's column for insertion into the RECORD.

[From the Atlanta Journal, May 9, 1985]

REA WAS DIFFERENT; A PARTNERSHIP, NOT A HANDOUT

(By Durwood McAlister)

Electricity, like everything else but hard times, came late to the McAlip's Chapel community of McNairy County, Tenn. The house in which I grew up sat almost in the shadow of high-power TVA transmission lines less than 30 miles from one of TVA's power-generating dams; but when I left to join the Navy in World War II our home was still being lighted by kerosene lamps.

By the time I returned, a remarkable transformation had taken place. I had missed the magic moment when the power came on, the dramatic leap from one age to another, but the evidences of a new way of life were everywhere.

McAlip's Chapel had left its primitive past behind.

Farm women who had spent their lives over wood stoves and washboards delighted in new electric ranges and automatic washing machines. Along unpaved country roads, on the strengthened front porches of un-

painted houses, gleaming new refrigerators and washing machines were proudly displayed for passers-by to appreciate.

Electric pumps had taken over the laborious task of drawing water from deep wells, bringing the comfort and convenience of indoor plumbing and doing away with the health hazard of open outdoor privies.

And rural breadwinners found themselves, for the first time, contemplating the possibility of jobs in light industry made possible by the availability of power.

The same thing was happening all across the country. And most of it came about as a result of an executive order signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

The story of how that came about, being recalled this week as the REA celebrates its 50th anniversary, is worth remembering.

During the mid-1920s, Roosevelt divided his time between his huge mansion at Hyde Park, N.Y., and a small cottage in rural Warm Springs, Ga. He later said that he became increasingly resentful of the fact that his electricity bill at the Warm Springs cottage "was about four times what I paid at Hyde Park."

His pique over that electric bill, he said, eventually led to the executive order, signed on May 11, 1935. The order provided for loan funds to be used on an areawide basis to build power lines into rural areas.

It took more than presidential pique and an executive order, however, to bring power to the boondocks.

Existing power companies showed little interest in the REA plan and it got off to a shaky start. In the end, it was the farmers themselves who formed the non-profit cooperatives which applied for, and got, the loans which enabled them to get the power they wanted.

A lot of government programs, including many of those initiated by Roosevelt, have been properly condemned by succeeding generations saddled with the debts they created.

But the REA program was different. It became not a handout, but a true partnership which electrified rural America and it still stands as a remarkable achievement in cooperative economic democracy.

For those of us old enough to remember the dark days, electricity is, indeed, a miracle. So too was the program which brought it to the backwoods of America.●

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 709. An act to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution relating to the death of President-elect Tancredo Neves of Brazil.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 61) of the Senate of the following title: "Joint resolution to designate the week of May 1, 1985, through May 7, 1985, as 'National Osteoporosis Awareness Week.'"

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FRANK H. BASSETT, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in tribute to and in memory of a longtime friend and constituent of mine, Senator Frank H. Bassett, Jr., of Hopkinsville, KY, who died on April 19, 1985, at the age of 78 at Jennie Stuart Medical Center in Hopkinsville, KY.

A native of Pembroke, KY, Senator Bassett was the son of the late Mamie Thompson Bassett and Dr. Frank H. Bassett, former Christian County court clerk.

From 1944 to 1946, Frank H. Bassett, Jr., served in the Kentucky House of Representatives. While in the house, Representative Bassett served on the legislative research commission. From 1958 to 1960, Frank H. Bassett, Jr., served in the Kentucky State Senate.

Senator Bassett was an inspiration to me, even during the years prior to my entering politics on the State level as a State senator in 1967. Indeed, Senator Bassett was a supporter of mine when I decided to run for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1974. Senator Frank Bassett was a dear friend of mine, and he was active in affairs of the Democratic Party on both the local and State levels for a number of years.

Frank Bassett was actively involved in his community. He retired as co-owner of Area Supply Co. in Hopkinsville and was also co-owner of the Blue Flame Coal Co. at White Plains, KY, in Hopkins County.

His interests were many in Hopkinsville. He was on the committee for the restoration and preservation of Riverside Chapel, a charter member of the Hopkinsville Community Concert Association, a former Kiwanian, and a member of the Chamber of Commerce and Elks Lodge.

Senator Bassett was a member of the First Baptist Church of Hopkinsville, where he was a deacon and a Sunday school teacher. A devoted son, he worked for his father as a deputy court clerk, and later served as a clerk in the State auditor's office during the administration of Kentucky Gov. Ruby Laffoon.

His career was also distinguished when he served for 5 years with the U.S. Department of Justice as a deputy U.S. marshal in the Panama Canal Zone. A loving husband and devoted father, Frank H. Bassett, Jr., is survived by his lovely wife Sara Belle McPherson Bassett; a son, Dr. Frank H. Bassett III of Durham, NC; a daughter, Betty June Bassett Clark of Hopkinsville; five grandchildren, and one great grandchild.

My wife Carol joins me in extending our sympathy to the survivors and

friends of this outstanding Kentuckian who was truly an inspiration to those of us who knew and loved him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, on May 14, 1985, I was unable to be present to cast my votes on rollcall Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, and 114. In my capacity as chairman of the Mining and Natural Resources Subcommittee, I was touring the Bureau of Mines in Pittsburgh, PA, whose jurisdiction falls under my subcommittee.

Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: "yea" on roll No. 108, "present" on roll No. 109, "yea" on roll No. 110, "nay" on roll No. 111, "yea" on roll No. 112, "yea" on roll No. 113, and "yea" on roll No. 114.●

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO REGULATE TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR HUMANITARIAN PURPOSES TO INDIVIDUALS LIVING IN SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the tradition of America to assist relatives, friends, and others in distress in other countries regardless of the state of relations between this country and that foreign country is longstanding. Senator BILL ARMSTRONG and I have introduced legislation to regulate the transfer of funds for humanitarian purposes to individuals residing in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The Office of Foreign Assets Control, through section 505,565 of the foreign assets control regulations, allows the transfer of not more than \$300 in any consecutive 3 month period to any one payee in Vietnam or \$12,000 per year. An additional one-time transfer of \$750 is permitted for the purpose of enabling the payee to emigrate from Vietnam. Our Government gave this permission because we believed that most recipients had direct or indirect connections with the U.S. Government or the deposed Government of South Vietnam.

We are all well aware by now of the limitations placed on people with pro-American backgrounds by the present Vietnamese regime. They are making it extremely difficult for them to maintain even minimal standards under the current economic conditions in Vietnam.

Thus our intention has been to permit people to send money to their families in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on humanitarian grounds. But even the greatest of intentions, as we all know, pave a well-traveled road often leading in directions we might otherwise take. There is currently strong evidence that suggests that Vietnamese refugees in this country are the victims of a systematic program of economic exploitation directed against them by that Socialist Republic of Vietnam. According to testimony delivered last year before the Senate Banking Committee's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, coerced appeals for money from Vietnamese refugees living in the United States are not uncommon. Witnesses and experts revealed this little known but alarming story at the 1984 hearing:

In 1981, Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRVN] Government authorities created an organized and efficient exploitation system "to exhaust the foreign exchange capabilities of overseas Vietnamese."

This exploitation system targets a list of all individuals in Vietnam who have relatives in the United States. Vietnamese cadres periodically contact people living in Vietnam and encourage them to write to their relatives to request money.

To transfer the money, a network of underground currency collection centers have been established in the United States. In response to these orchestrated appeals, Vietnamese refugees have taken U.S. currency to the centers. The U.S. currency is consolidated at periodic intervals and then smuggled out of the United States to the State Bank of Vietnam. The intended recipients are given a very small amount of Vietnamese currency which is immediately subject to regressive taxation or outright confiscation.

In many American cities, there are sizeable Vietnamese communities which are vulnerable to these appeals. Some 13 collection centers from Los Angeles to New Orleans to Arlington, VA, reportedly are funneling an estimated \$18 million per month to the hands of the SRVN.

When one considers the weakness of Vietnam's economy, the reasons for exploitation of overseas Vietnamese becomes increasingly clear. A terribly poor country with a per capita income lower than India's nonetheless, it has the fourth largest army in the world. With a population that has exploded from some 38 million in the early 1970's to more than 60 million today, Vietnam is often afflicted by severe shortages of food, raw materials, and spare parts. Its foreign currency reserves, according to an International Monetary Fund team that visited Vietnam in April 1983 are approximately \$16 million.

We cannot permit millions of dollars to leave this country on an annual basis to uncertain destinations somewhere in Southeast Asia; money which is likely to be used to finance the military adventurism of this bellicose regime. Despite continuing international condemnation and a failing economy, Hanoi consistently refuses to negotiate a Cambodian settlement that might alter its own hegemony. Since the late 1970's, Hanoi has sought to impose on Cambodia a totalitarian regime in its own mold, and to serve Vietnamese needs. Moscow's estimated \$1 billion a year in economic and military assistance to Vietnam subsidizes its occupation of Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to guard against the building of a clandestine currency transfer network influenced by that government of which I speak which is unregulated, invites exploitation by criminal elements, and which presents our law enforcement agencies with a complicated web of deception and intrigue. A 1984 Department of Treasury study of Vietnamese involvement in clandestine international currency transfer invested approximately 2,000 man hours of active involvement in travel, informant handling, and street-level collection work, operating in Vietnamese communities in Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, Houston, and in my own district the city of Westminster. The study, formally known as Project VICTOR, concluded that approximately \$18,000,000 leaves the United States monthly for Vietnam. Of this \$18,000,000, approximately \$9,000,000 per month is transferred by clandestine methods and the remainder by banks.

□ 1550

Project VICTOR has exposed that day after day, in cities all across this country where there are significant concentrations of Vietnamese refugees, they are given no alternative than to take their money to storefronts and backrooms. They must entrust their family's welfare to unregulated currency transfer operators who not only skim off a substantial percentage of the funds, at least that is the testimony. But may also be acting in the interests of a hostile foreign power. Evidence suggests that just one minor operation can account for as much as a quarter million dollars per year. In U.S. cities with significantly larger Southeast Asian populations there are cases under investigation that may involve of as much as a quarter million dollars per month from Vietnamese refugees.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Vietnamese people in the United States need to have some means of transferring a reasonable level of funds for humanitarian purposes to family members in Vietnam, without enriching a regime they dislike, and in fact despise. We

need to protect them against insidiously involved shadowy underground practices designed solely to bolster the SRVN's insatiable need for hard, a substantially hard currency reserve.

Vietnamese refugees, like other immigrants who have come to the United States, feel a great responsibility to those relatives still in their homeland. They send money home because of their deepest commitment to their families. This is a natural outgrowth of a 3,000-year-old veneration of the family as a divine principle. It is easy to see why it would be difficult to enjoy the comforts of their new country while the families they had to leave behind are often subject to repressive economic and political conditions.

It is tragic to hear a refugee lament that when he sends \$100 to his wife, she will actually get very little of it. Yet he keeps sending the money because, even if she gets just \$10, that is of some assistance. Or to hear a refugee's sad story that his 9-year-old daughter, gravely ill with rheumatic fever, receives a cable from his wife for money, but the little girl died 4 days later before the money arrived.

The 1984 Treasury study concluded that:

The problems under examination are not simple problems and there are no simple answers to the many questions we have raised. Indeed, the only simplicity we can find is our simple, moral duty to protect the Vietnamese people in the United States from exploitation originating both from within their community and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States should not allow cold, cynical manipulation of those Vietnamese refugees who have sought the protection that our democracy affords. Nor should we permit the continued operation of underground centers which exist for the sole purpose of abusing our new neighbors. Moreover, in light of the high welfare dependency rate among these newly arrived refugees, the Federal Government has additional interest in stopping this intolerable problem.

The legislation that Senator ARMSTRONG and I have introduced proposes that there be established in the Treasury of the United States the Vietnam Humanitarian Remittance Fund, consisting solely of money paid in by Vietnamese refugees who wish to send such sums to their relatives abroad.

Upon implementation the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue notes drawn on amounts held in the fund which are payable to designated individual recipients in Vietnam. No note thus issued may be redeemed out of the Treasury unless it is accompanied by a declaration signed by both the recipient and a responsible official of the State Bank of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam which attests to the amount of funds actually received by the designated recipient; that the re-

recipient has actual use of all the funds which were sent; that no duress was employed in soliciting the funds or in obtaining the recipient's signature, and the lack of any special taxation or denial of human rights imposed on the recipient in connection with the redemption of this note.

Our legislation proposes that clandestine money be unlawful and suggests that it be the sense of Congress that the President of the United States seek to negotiate with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam for random monitoring of our humanitarian remittance program by a U.S. or multilateral team of inspectors in Vietnam.

Our bill proposes that in the event inspection teams report a pattern or practice of abuse of the procedures thus established for the sending of humanitarian remittances to Vietnam, all such remittances will be curtailed.

Our proposal does not intend to usurp or upset our current foreign policy direction with respect to Vietnam. It merely suggests that we demonstrate a commitment to restoring the integrity of humanitarian assistance for people in this country who desire to send currency to their relatives in Vietnam. It would seem that principles of equity require nothing less. I urge all my colleagues to study the suggestions embodied in the bill, and hopefully to cosponsor this bill.

Mr. Speaker, some have suggested that maybe this would not work because it would require the active participation of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and I understand that. But the point is that we need to make a gesture; set up some sort of system, which, if we do get their cooperation, will work.

Right now, unfortunately, many of our Vietnamese members of the community throughout this country, those who are citizen and noncitizen alike who have fled tyranny in their home country, are being beset by requests for money. Money they know which can help their people and their relatives in their homeland, but they have to bring that money through a system which allows for fraud and abuse and is skimming both on this side of the ocean as well as the other.

Certainly we ought to take some steps in this country to establish that system. I would suggest that if the Vietnamese Government does need hard currency, and the currency that is sent over for the benefit of individuals who live in their country can only be redeemed in this manner, that there would be a tremendous incentive for them to cooperate with us.

I hold out no hopes for the humanitarian gesture, or the humanitarian nature of the response that we would get from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam's Government, but I would hold out hope that this would create

an environment, an environment of incentives for them to work with us.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it must be better than the present situation which besets so many of our Vietnamese friends and neighbors in communities across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

DETERRENCE, MODERNIZATION, AND THE NUCLEAR FREEZE II—SOVIET ICBM'S VERSUS U.S. SILOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCoin] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. AuCoin. Mr. Speaker, The Defense authorization bill has been reported from the Armed Services Committee and will shortly be before the House for amendments. In this period of calm before the storm, we should pause to consider more than the expense of that bill, massive and mammoth as it may be.

We also need to consider the strategy, the fundamental rationale, behind our Nation's military program.

That's why I am today taking the second in what will be a series of special orders to examine the military danger into which the Republican administration's national security policy is taking our Nation.

I will contrast this perilous program with the emerging democratic concept for America's military security—a concept that is as superior to its Republican counterpart as the Trident submarine is superior to the Maginot Line.

Today I will discuss one specific threat: The growing ability of Soviet ICBM's to destroy U.S. ICBM silos in a first-strike surprise attack, a nuclear, Pearl Harbor. I will show how the weak Republican program will allow this Soviet threat to escalate without limit, while providing this country with no military countermeasures of any value. And I will show how the strong democratic plan—to freeze Soviet accuracy and to harden our silos—is the superior military solution the American people are looking for at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the Bitburg Cemetery has shown us how this Republican administration can make an abominable, miserably wrong decision—and persist in the blunder, no matter what.

Is it possible that the administration could be as wrong on strategic policy as it has been wrong on SS graves? Is it possible that the Government of a great power can make such a monumental error in a matter affecting its very national survival?

Of course it's possible. Just because someone has reached high office doesn't mean he can't make mistakes—

immense mistakes with terrible consequences.

The French made a mistake with the Maginot Line. Our own Government made one in the 1940's at Pearl Harbor. Every nation concerned made a grave mistake at the beginning of the First World War.

Today, the Republican administration is making a similar mistake.

□ 1600

The mistake we are on the verge of making and in the course of making today with this administration does not involve, as in the case of World War I, tanks and Gatling guns, it involves doomsday weapons, weapons which put at risk the whole human race. As I will demonstrate this afternoon, the administration's strategic nuclear programs—both weapons and arms control—are irrelevant to the threat that America faces today.

In a recent news conference, Ronald Reagan said it was "the most ridiculous thing he'd ever heard" to say we have military parity with the Soviet Union. As evidence, he said the Soviets have more conventional weapons and more nuclear megatonnage than we do.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman in the Oval Office, he missed the point by a country mile. The danger isn't from Soviet megatons, which are actually declining as they follow in the course we have chosen—namely, moving toward smaller and higher quality warheads. And the greatest danger isn't in their numbers of conventional weapons. We have chosen quality above quantity, and the outcome of the various Middle East conflicts suggest we've chosen the right course.

The more serious danger we face is from Soviet strategic nuclear weapons that are becoming ever quicker and more accurate. The Republican policymakers seem completely blind to this fact. We should all be disturbed that Mr. Reagan, and the entire Republican Party, are sailing along blissfully unaware of the most serious military threat our Nation has ever faced.

Today I am going to look very closely at the oncoming increase in the speed and accuracy of Soviet strategic nuclear weapons, and their significance for America's national survival.

Two months ago the House voted to continue production of the MX Glassjaw missile. Members made this decision by the narrowest of margins—if only three of my colleagues had voted otherwise, the decision would have gone the other way and the MX Glassjaw would have been canceled.

Ironically, the House took this action largely for reasons of arms control. If it were not for the belief that the Glassjaw MX will somehow bring us closer to arms control at some time

in the distant future, this missile would have been soundly defeated—probably in the other body as well as on this floor.

I do not doubt the sincerity of those who oppose the MX Glassjaw on its merits, but who reluctantly supported it in sincere hope that it would lead to arms control.

But at the same time, there are questions I must put to my colleagues who took that position: My questions are these:

Do you know what the arms control proposals now being put forth by our negotiators in Geneva actually say? Do you?

Do you know the specific details of the plan in whose name you have voted to spend billions of dollars for a missile you know to be useless from a military standpoint?

Do you know if the Republican administration has any plan whatever to keep Soviet missiles from becoming more accurate? Are we working for that in Geneva? Do you know that?

Do you know if the Republican administration has any plan to keep Soviet missiles from becoming quicker and more dangerous in that respect, and more capable of surprise?

Do you know if the Republican administration has any plan to lower the number of quick accurate warheads the Soviets will have ready to attack each and every one of our silos?

And do you know the nature of the war plans under which the Glassjaw MX and our other nuclear weapons would be used? Do you know these things? Have you been briefed on the SIOP, the Single Integrated Operational Plan that governs the way this country would employ its strategic nuclear weapons?

In almost all conversations I have had with my colleagues, I have found the answer to be no. Almost without exception, the administration's support comes from those who say, and may even believe, they support arms control—but who would be unable to tell us exactly what it is they are supporting.

Recently I received a briefing, at my request, from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on the Reagan administration's position at Geneva. Since the details of that briefing are classified I will, of course, not discuss them on the floor of the House. Instead, I'll base the remainder of my remarks on those aspects of the administration's START position, which have been previously released.

But I recommend to each Member of this House, each Member who may be watching on the video monitors, and those who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, that you receive this briefing yourselves. It is crucial that you do.

You need not worry about taking much time out of your busy schedules

to do it. I say this because the Reagan administration's entire negotiating position can be laid out for you in approximately 30 seconds, or perhaps 40 seconds if the briefer talks slowly. And short as it is on detail, you will find it even shorter on substance.

Most of all, no one will find an arms control reason after seeing or hearing this briefing to support a vote for the MX Glassjaw. And no one will find a reason to give credence to our negotiators when they return to Washington as they always do, to once again peddle new nuclear weapons, as surely they will when the next Glassjaw vote approaches here in the Congress.

Before we go any further down this road, this Orwellian path on which arms race means arms control, I say we should take a very good look at where it will take us.

To take such a look: this is the purpose of this series of special orders which I began on March 20, and which I continue today.

When I began on March 20, I told the House that the Republican administration's national security policies—arms control and weapons combined—are, in strictly military terms, leading our Nation to disaster.

I pointed out how the Republican administration is worshipping at the altar of the false god of weapons "modernization." I pointed out how the Republican administration has failed to consider the other side of the coin; it has turned its eyes away from the unpleasant fact that there is no way we can modernize our nuclear and space weapons without allowing the Soviet Union to do precisely the same thing.

I pointed out how the end result of the next decade of bilateral weapons modernization on both sides will be a radical increase in the Soviet Union's ability to conduct a disarming first strike against us, and a corresponding decrease in our ability to deter such a strike. All this will happen because this administration refuses to give up, under any circumstances, the weapons it desires—even though these weapons will, in light of Soviet countermoves, leave us militarily weaker than we were at the outset.

I pointed out how there is a far better alternative: We can stop Soviet weapons from getting quicker and from getting more accurate. We can do this by shutting off their ballistic missile flight testing as part of a mutual, verifiable negotiated nuclear freeze.

And while I subjected the administration's national security policies to the condemnation they so richly deserve, at the same time I emphasized that none of my criticism was pointed at the hardy band of courageous Republicans who have voted for national security again and again, by casting their votes for the nuclear freeze and against the MX Glassjaw missile. I say

it once more: These men and women have voted their consciences in the face of the most intense political pressure, and they have earned the Nation's thanks.

But Ronald Reagan and those who now make national security policy have not earned the Nation's thanks. On the contrary, they have set us on a road leading to ever weaker and weaker deterrence, and ever higher and higher risk of nuclear war.

I know these are serious charges. This afternoon, and in the days to follow, I will document them.

Today I'll begin with the problem of Soviet ICBM attack on our own ICBM silos. We need to understand this in order to judge not only the MX Glassjaw, but the general question of nuclear deterrence.

FREEZING ICBM'S

Our Nation has just over 1,000 ICBM silos scattered across the North Central States. Traditionally, these silos have achieved survivability by the combination of three assets: numbers, dispersion, and hardness.

When we originally built our ICBM silos in the 1960's, we made them so numerous and widely dispersed that the Soviet single-warhead missiles of that time would have had to exhaust themselves had they attempted to attack us. That is, the Soviets would have had to use up at least one of their ICBM's to destroy one of ours. This was clearly an unattractive proposition for the attacker, and contributed to deterrence by discouraging attack.

But we lost the protection of numbers in the mid-1970's, when the Soviets began to put several warheads on each missile. This is the multiple-warhead technology called MIRV. It allows them to threaten to take out several of our missiles while using up only one of theirs.

Under the Nixon administration, in SALT I, we had the chance to keep the Soviets from getting MIRV missiles. We could have prohibited MIRV flight tests, which the Soviets had not yet conducted successfully. But we blew the opportunity.

Acting on precisely the same short-sighted and foolish principles which motivate the Reagan administration today, the Nixon administration was then so determined to build its own MIRV's that it was willing to let the Soviets get theirs as well. As a result, our ICBM silos lost one of their key protections, and our ability to deter attack decreased accordingly.

Years later, Henry Kissinger would say to a congressional committee: "I wish I'd never heard of MIRV."

Mr. Kissinger's hindsight is nice, but foresight would have been better—and safer for America.

Of course, multiple warheads themselves aren't enough to destroy our

silos. These silos are hardened to perhaps 2,000 pounds per square inch, which means they can survive the shock of a nuclear blast unless the explosion is very close—that is, unless the attacking weapon is very accurate.

So America and the Soviet Union are now engaged in a race, pitting the hardness of our silos against the accuracy of their ICBM's.

We're losing this race.

As General Scowcroft, the father of the MX Glassjaw himself, said recently: "In a race between hardness and accuracy, accuracy will always win."

But America doesn't have to run this losing race.

The nuclear freeze the Democrats want can redefine the rules. The freeze produces real military security by locking Soviet first-strike accuracy in place and permitting American silo hardness to move ahead.

In short, the nuclear freeze can preserve and actually increase the survivability of our ICBM silos. And survivability is the very essence of deterrence.

This is how we can halt and even reverse the insecurity through modernization the Reagan administration is imposing on America.

What can we do? Here's our opportunity:

It is a fact that further improvement in Soviet ICBM accuracy will require either new missiles or major improvements to existing models. A Soviet program to develop a new ICBM would require between 20 and 30 flight tests before a war planner would have enough confidence in it to use it in a surprise attack first strike.

But it's also a fact that new missiles cannot be developed without flight testing.

We Democrats seek to prevent that flight testing. We want to do it through a bilateral, verifiable, negotiated nuclear freeze.

And unlike the fantastic trillion-dollar concoction called star wars, the nuclear freeze is free.

Verifying Soviet compliance with a flight-test ban under a freeze would be easy. ICBM flight tests need large, visible preparations; they are easily detected by various types of satellite, aircraft, shipboard, and land-based monitors.

Under the freeze, there would be no way new Soviet ICBM's could be developed to the point at which they could be deployed.

Of course, it is unlikely that no flight tests will mean no change in missile performance forever. A completely static freeze isn't realistic. But neither is it necessary.

Small improvements in the accuracy of existing ICBM's are possible without flight testing. For example, the uncertainty regarding the position of both target and launch point can be decreased by more accurate satellite

measurements. And irregularities in the Earth's gravitational field can be further measured and compensated for.

But militarily significant accuracy improvements will require major upgrades in such things as guidance hardware and software, in multiple warhead separation techniques, and in reentry vehicle design. These cannot be deployed untested without the risk of catastrophic failure. Thus, radical Soviet guidance changes that would lead to very high accuracy will be out of the question under the freeze.

Missiles are complex devices, pushing the state of technology to the limit—and sometimes beyond. Without full-system flight testing it's impossible to know with confidence how one component will interact with another. Computer analysis and captive testing are marvelous techniques, but they cannot fully simulate the acceleration, the vibration, the temperature changes, and the component interaction of real flight.

This has been demonstrated by the five new large ballistic missiles which have seen their first test in this decade: the Soviet SS-X-24, SS-X-25, and SS-N-20, and the U.S. MX Pershing 2. Four of these five missiles failed their first flight test.

It's true that some missile components could be secretly tested in military or civilian space vehicles.

But this wouldn't be of much use, since there are differences between such things as the trajectories, the reentry phenomena, and so forth of a space flight on the one hand and a ballistic missile on the other hand.

Moreover, there is the key problem of what weapons designers call the interfaces. That is, experience shows that two component parts of a missile may work fine by themselves, but when you put them together you may find they interact in a way that creates a problem nobody could have predicted. This is why it is impossible to have confidence in the reliability of components which have never been tested together. A guidance system might work fine in a space probe, but fail completely when put into a ballistic missile. This is why both we and the Soviets do so many tests—and why so many early tests fail.

Soviet war planners fully understand that installing a new guidance upgrade and having it fail in the midst of an actual strategic nuclear first strike surprise attack would spoil their whole day. It would leave them vulnerable to devastating U.S. retaliation.

Under the freeze, a Soviet missile designer would have to choose either proven reliability or theoretical accuracy; he could not have both. He could stick with his present force, which is adequate for deterrence and retaliation but not accurate enough for a comprehensive first strike. Alterna-

tively, he could install new, theoretically better but untested components—and risk catastrophic failure.

Neither course leads to a high-confidence first strike. This is precisely the predicament in which Democrats seek to place the Soviets. The freeze will do it.

I repeat: The freeze will make a Soviet surprise attack first strike against our silos far more difficult than any other course we can choose. This is the essence of the national security case for the freeze.

By preventing new Soviet ICBM's and drastically limiting accuracy improvements on present Soviet ICBM's, the freeze will soon stop the decline in the survivability of American ICBM warheads. Even better, the freeze can enable us to harden our targets against frozen Soviet accuracy. In this way, we can dramatically increase the number of American ICBM warheads that would survive a Soviet surprise attack.

That, and only that, is deterrence.

That, and only that, will reduce the danger of nuclear war.

The better our weapons are able to survive attack, the less the chance that they will ever need to do so. The better Mr. Gorbachev knows our weapons can survive, the less the chance that he will be tempted to attack.

At this point, I'm going to insert in the RECORD a table. Using standard calculation methods, this table contrasts U.S. silo-based ICBM warhead survivability under the Republican modernization with that under the freeze that we Democrats support. The table illustrates two modernization cases: with and without satellite guidance. It also shows two freeze cases: with and without the small accuracy improvement that might be possible under a flight-test ban.

The table doesn't deal with cratering effects, because if the missile can crater the silo, as Soviet missiles will be able to do under the Republican modernization but not under the Democratic freeze, survivability will be so low it will be unmeasurable.

The table follows:

TABLE I.—U.S. RELIABLE ICBM WARHEADS SURVIVING WITH MODERNIZATION
(Mid-1990's)

U.S. silo hardness	MX-quality attack	Satellite-guided attack
2,000 psi (present U.S.)	10	<10
6,000 psi (present Soviet)	40	<10
10,000 psi	100	<10
20,000	260	<10

U.S. RELIABLE ICBM WARHEADS SURVIVING WITH A FREEZE

(Mid-1990's)

U.S. silo hardness	Worst case (10 pct Soviet accuracy gain)	Static freeze (no change from 1984)	Rusting missiles (1 pct annual accuracy and reliability loss for 20 years)
2,000 psi (present U.S.)	330	440	660
6,000 psi (present Soviet)	780	910	1,020
10,000 psi	940	1,130	1,160
20,000 psi	1,210	1,370	1,310

Mr. AuCOIN. The table shows that even the theoretical worst case under the freeze will leave us better off than the best we could expect under this thing the Republicans call modernization. And at any given level of silo hardness, the freeze will give us many times more surviving silo-based warheads than we could get from modernization.

Moreover, while this is difficult to quantify, it appears certain that the accuracy and reliability of both sides will decline without flight testing.

Because testing existing ballistic missiles as well as new types will be prohibited, problems in component aging and design will inevitably arise. Some component aging problems can be detected and the components replaced. But high-confidence fixes, especially of design problems, will be impossible without flight testing. And because of the ever-present possibility of defects which will be undetectable and unknown if there is no testing, confidence in accuracy and reliability will decline even more than real capability. General Vessey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a Reagan appointee, made this point in testimony before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee earlier this year.

While loss of confidence in untested weapons will affect both us and the Soviets, it won't affect us equally. For both technical and psychological reasons, loss of confidence in existing weapons will help deterrence and further discourage a Soviet surprise first strike.

Let's look at the technical reasons first.

The fine edge of state-of-the-art accuracy and reliability is essential for a first strike against hard ICBM silos. but this is not what America needs, because we are not a first-strike nation. What we need is a deterrent that can survive, retaliate, and devastate any aggressor, no matter what the aggressor does to stop us. This mission needs weapons that can survive anything the other side can throw at them. It does not need superhigh reliability and accuracy.

The best way to shift the nuclear balance away from first-strike and toward deterrence is to force both sides to let their weapons sit untested.

Whenever I suggest this, I am always asked how we can keep our missiles reliable if we don't test them. This is a good question, but it's only half the question we need to ask.

The other half is this: How can the Soviets keep their missiles reliable if they don't test them?

The answer is, of course, that they can't. If neither side can flight test its missiles, over the years the reliability of these missiles will go down.

At first glance, this might seem to be a bad thing. After all, if we are going to reduce our numbers of nuclear weapons, isn't it essential that those which remain be highly reliable devices in which we have the highest confidence?

Again, this is only half of the essential question. The other half is this: Do we want the Soviet missiles to be highly reliable devices in which they have the highest confidence? Or do we want Soviet missiles to sit and rust?

Putting the two halves of the question together, we must ask ourselves this: Do we want to have reliable weapons so badly that we are willing to let the other side have them too? Or can we gain so much from Soviet weapons unreliability that it's worth letting our own missiles lose reliability as well?

The more you look at these questions, the more clear it becomes that missile unreliability is stabilizing, provided it occurs on both sides.

Here's why:

A first-strike surprise attack is an extremely difficult mission. Everything has to work just right for the aggressor. His targets are difficult to hit, and there are a lot of them. If only a small proportion of the aggressor's weapons fail, he will receive devastating retaliation from the other side's surviving weapons.

In contrast, deterrence by threat of retaliation is an easy mission. The major targets are relatively few, and they're not well protected. We can easily send many warheads against every major economic target in the Soviet Union. If one warhead fails, the target will be destroyed by the second, or the third.

So if we drive reliability down on both sides, if we force both sides to make do with rusty missiles, surprise attack first strike will become more difficult, and deterrence will become easier. This is precisely what we need to do.

Now let's look at the psychological implications of unreliable missiles.

Psychologists tell us that uncertainty has its greatest effect when a choice is available.

Suppose I am in a third-story room in a burning building. There are some bushes underneath my window but I'm not sure how thick they are and I'm not sure I can survive the jump. If the fire is two rooms away, rather than

risk the uncertainty of the leap, I'll probably stay where I am. But if the fire is lapping at my feet, I'll have no choice and I'll take my chances with the jump.

The nuclear standoff is just like that.

It is the first striker who has the free choice of whether to use nuclear weapons or not to use them. So he will be deterred by lack of confidence in his untested weapons—and by the prospect of enemy weapons surviving to retaliate. But the victim finds himself with very little choice; he must retaliate, and will do it with whatever weapons he has, whether they have first-strike reliability or not.

General Vessey confirmed this when I asked him about it last year. He agreed that we couldn't have high confidence in our weapons if they hadn't been tested for years. But if the enemy attacks, this won't be a factor. As he put it, we'll just "go with what we have."

So the freeze will let us do what we need to do: we'll be able to deter by threat of retaliation. But it will stop the Russians from doing what we're afraid they might do, which is a Pearl Harbor type surprise attack first strike.

In order to do this, it is essential that the freeze prohibit testing and deployment of all ballistic missiles, not merely of new types. This is necessary both to lower confidence in existing weapons, and to prevent their upgrading.

I don't have much enthusiasm for a freeze that applies only to new types of weapons.

If, for example, testing of the present Soviet SS-18 and SS-19 ICBM's were permitted to continue, there would be little to be gained by shutting off tests of the new SS-24 and SS-25. Although the SS-18 and SS-19 are less reliable because of their liquid fuel, if we let them be tested without restriction, their guidance systems can be upgraded without limit. They can become nearly as effective first-strike devices as any new-type missile. The same applies to submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

This brings me to the next threat we need to look at: the threat of Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missiles attacking our silos. I will examine these in my next special order.

For now, the summary of the two positions on the threat of Soviet ICBM's is clear:

We Democrats have a workable plan to protect our ICBM's from Soviet ICBM's: By shutting off Soviet flight testing through a mutual, verifiable, negotiated freeze we will prevent Soviet ICBM's from becoming more accurate, and we will make them less reliable. Soviet first-strike capability will go down, and U.S. deterrence will

go up as we increase the hardness of our silos and our number of survivable ICBM warheads rises from the present 400 up to well above 1,000.

In contrast, the Republican plan is no plan at all. If the Republican National Security Program is carried out exactly as proposed by Mr. Reagan, America's survivable silo-based ICBM warheads, regardless of hardening, will drop to near zero.

And this is only the beginning. When we consider the threat from Soviet submarine-launched ballistic missiles, which can strike with less warning than can their ICBM's, the military inadequacy of the Republican defense posture is even more dramatic. It stands in stark contrast to the obnoxious chest pounding and nonsensical talk we hear from Republican slogan-writers about America standing tall.

I will examine this in detail during my next special order, which will be 2 weeks from today.

□ 1630

ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in pursuit of what I started several months ago here in this forum in my advice to the privileged orders, in this case of America.

I again for the record indicate a little bit of explanation, the historical initial beginning of this phrase, "the advice to privileged orders." As I have said before, it is based upon the exact track or essay that was written by the great revolutionary American, Revolutionary War hero at the time. He was also a chaplain for George Washington's Revolutionary Army. He was also an intellect, and literary figure, internationally established and a poet. He wrote very significant verse and prose which is as apt to us today as it was when it was written in the context of the world as it then existed.

□ 1640

His different appeal was based on his visit to the privileged orders of Europe for the need of revolutionary changes.

Being that at that point the French Revolution was in its beginning phases, because we must never forget that the French Revolution almost quite coincidental with the American Revolution, it was the American Revolution that gave birth to the most radical concept of all in terms of that world and the governments existing, and the form of governments that prevailed in the world at that time.

I think, as I have said before, that is very well reflected in the first five or seven words in the preamble of our U.S. Constitution. It had never been thought that a power, or what is called sovereignty in formal words, would ever be from anybody but a king or a potentate who, in turn, attributed his source of power to God, a divine right. And when the Americans evolved the concept which is still supposedly prevailing with us because our Constitution is supposed to be still in force, and that was that all power emanated from the people, the people of the United States who were forming the Constitution. And in the preamble it sets out the basic reasons for its enactment.

But that was a very revolutionary thought in that world.

Incidentally it was today. As a matter of fact, when the words are used, "We the people" today, we usually read them in the context of what we defined as socialistic or communistic endeavors or movements. But they in turn, even though they are doing so and appealing in the name of the people, usually are appealing so in the name of authoritarian terms, such as the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Then the obverse of that medal, being the fascist corporate type of state which I have always felt would be the greatest source of danger to us in the United States than a communistic or socialistic type of endeavor. On that obverse side we see the actual source of power. And we must remember, and I say by way of parenthesis, Adolph Hitler was the ruling head or standard-bearer of the National Socialist Party, and Benito Mussolini—now, of course, those names here I think the overwhelming majority, I would say at least 65 percent of the membership of my colleagues in the House, these words have only historical and intellectual significance—but to those of us still around who lived and breathed in the atmosphere and context of that world, very different images are conveyed to us. Whether it was Benito Mussolini, whom today seldom is referred to, and the beginning of what he called the Fascist state or the corporate state, the power, even though he arose on the backs of the laboring class. When Benito Mussolini got started, he got started as a labor union leader. He developed his power on the basis of the working-class element in Italy that catapulted him into power. What happened both in his case as well as in Hitler's, and, of course, in 1917 and 1918 with the advent of the Bolshevik sector of the Russian political parties in power and the evolution of the Soviet Socialist representatives, in turn predicated on what the jargon or the dialecticians which have always been difficult for me to understand, have predicated on the rule of the

working people, the dictatorship of the proletariat; all involved the very antithesis of the concept that the people themselves in the long run are the best judges as to what is best for them. To the extent that we have strayed from that in the United States, we have gotten into very difficult straits.

In my advice to the privileged orders, and as I have said before this includes primarily now my colleagues, because those of us calling ourselves Representatives are now, as a collective body in the Congress of the United States, a rather select, a privileged, if you please, group. Economically the rate of pay places us in that upper apex of the 7 to 10 percent in the United States. And I think this is very, very indicative of why certain things have been happening, why other things have been permitted to happen unquestioned, and why some things are happening now that the Congress should be considering, in my opinion, as matters of first priority, and are not.

I think it is significant to reflect on the fact that with the state of being, where better than one-third of the Members in the other body are calculated to be in the millionaire class, and now a very substantial number of those in the House are in the upper 5 percent stratum of our society as far as income is concerned, and with the corollary advent of the so-called political action PAC's which have invested in the last congressional races more than \$130 million, that we now have, in my opinion, the impact of all of these three various current forces now impinging on our political and democratic processes reflected in the legislation and in the quality of legislation, but more importantly in the frustration to obtain action on what is unquestionably vital areas of consideration.

In my appeal to the privileged orders of America, I have said that the greatest and foremost need is for us to remember our revolutionary heritage. Instead we are frightened at the word "revolution."

And this terrible misconception, as to what the real world is, in our immediate vicinity, to the south of us, particularly and forgetting about the far distances in the other sections of the globe, that it is such a fatal error that as I see the irreversible course of President Ronald Reagan in the judgment decisions made thus far that seem to indicate an irreversible course of action that I see leads us to catastrophe and in what will be a terrible loss, in my opinion an unnecessary loss, of treasury and blood flower of our youth.

□ 1650

More importantly, and I think the most ominous aspect as I see it, is that it will be pitting our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren into eras of eternal enmity and hostility in this what we call new world.

We will have learned nothing from the experience of the older world, where we have these ancient and pre-erit hatreds and rivalries, carrying over even to this day and time in which we have, on several occasions, so blithely immersed ourselves, ignoring the history and ignoring the facts involved in that real world.

So that when I hear some of my colleagues express concern about the question of the basic predicate upon which we are now constructing not only our domestic budgetary edifice but our international and above all, our defense.

I have pointed out before to the same privileged orders, because now what Eisenhower called, President Eisenhower called the military-industrial complex is in total sway of these great corporate panjandrum that are interlocked now with all of our vast and powerful international, multinational now, banking and financial corporate structures that the power there now is so vast that as I have said before, and this is not idle talk, and I have always been very conscious in my selection of words, as to their meaning and the gravity of the significance of their use, and have never, never used a word unless very carefully preselected and with a very well-honed idea and thought as to the impact of the significance and the meaning of these words or phrases.

So that when I say that these forces now are in total control of the powers of decision that are basic to a nation's economic, that is, fiscal and monetary well-being, that we really should, here in the Congress, finally, somehow, even if it is perhaps later than we realize, rise and at least try to interpose some of the interests of the greatest number of our citizens in this country; the true and the greatest interests of the greatest number.

I have pointed out that, given this type of control by forces and individuals and collections of individuals who are not accountable to the people; they are not elected; they do not have to be: They control the processes, why should they bother?

As I have pointed out repeatedly, these factors, particularly the financial and banking, have now acquired the power that such men as Thomas Jefferson and subsequent great Presidents; the one immediately after Thomas Jefferson expressing his great concern that these vested interests not be given the power of what they called the allocation of the nation's credit resources, have indeed now reached the point where for at least two decades,

maybe a little bit more but at least two decades, they have been.

In every one of these steps leading to this total acquisition of power, the Congress has either wittingly or unwittingly aided and abetted.

I have pointed out that the biggest fear of such great leaders as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and the next, Abraham Lincoln who, on the very week that he died, had this uppermost in his mind of the utmost concern, and said so explicitly in words that those classes of powerful entities surely do not want to recall and kind of shudder at anybody recalling much less uttering them.

Then next, after the 1907-08 depression and financial catastrophe, and the 1913 resulting enactment by the Congress of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, President Woodrow Wilson, even before the entry of the United States into World War I, was quick to express his apprehension about how the intent had been even in the beginning distorted.

Now when we read the history of the enactment of the Federal Reserve Board Act of 1913, we have to read the history of the activities of what was known as the Pujo Committee, named after a Member of the House of Representatives, Chairman Pujo, who began the initial investigatory and oversight hearings after the fiscal-financial depression in 1908 in this country, the Panic of 1907 and the continuing crisis.

Precisely for the same reason of the panic of the 1860's, the panic of 1837, for example, basically the same reasons, but the difference being that during that period of growth the country had what one thinker called a safety valve, the frontier. We do not have that any longer.

This is why I always thought that President John Kennedy's adoption of his slogan of the day, "the new frontier" was so apt, because this is exactly the terms that we should be using in constructing our concepts of what has to be done in order to bring economic justice to the American people, which certainly nobody can say we really have.

Now at this moment we are being beset by some of the headlines in some cases, and some of the back page stories, with respect to the peculiar class of savings and loan institutions that have a rather disappointing and alarming remembrance of what some of us lived through during the depression era, as we were growing up but still recall vividly.

We are puzzled. Even members of the Committee on Banking—of which I have been a member for 24 years, since I first came up—and actually, I do not know whether to laugh or cry, because it reflects the very things that some of us have been talking out on since 1965. It was obvious then to any-

body that studied carefully and just did not let his mind be influenced by special pleading of the special interests, that America was headed for serious trouble.

Also, it would require, not only a reading of but a remembrance of history. History is a seamless web. It is not a neatly compartmentalized series of events. The events today are only the results of things that have anteceded this present day and time.

So that it was obvious in the beginning of the decades of the sixties that the world had changed, that the Europe of the forties and the fifties was a vastly different world.

My first year in this body I had the privilege of sitting in on the first so-called debates on what turned out to be the Kennedy rounds and the adoption of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

As strong a supporter of President Kennedy, I did not vote for that one gem of legislative program that he presented to the Congress.

□ 1700

And the reason I did not was because of clauses that were incorporated into that agreement that reflected that American interests were going to be very vulnerable and that there would be no way that those manufacturing industrial complexes of our Nation would find themselves competitive, no way. No matter how much they modernized, no matter what innovations were inaugurated for production, and the like, it would be an impossible competitive world. But at that time there were no symptoms overtly, and when I asked the question as to why a certain clause was included in that bill, I received no answer.

My practice and principle ever since I have held a representative elective office—and I might remind my colleagues that that began 33 years ago in the City Council of the city of San Antonio, and then later 5 years in the State senate of the State of Texas, and now about 24 years here on this level—that my principle of behavior has been that if questions of a serious nature cannot be answered satisfactorily, that action that is sought of my vote will not be forthcoming, and either I will vote "no" or I will vote "present."

I might point out for the benefit of the Members here that have not been here this long that I was considered the originator of this concept of voting "present." That vote was unheard of when I came here to the House. But when I saw that bills were brought up from the Ways and Means Committee, tax bills, with a closed rule, that is, nobody could offer amendments, you could not do anything much other than either vote up or vote down, I did not feel that I could support a closed

rule, and I voted no. And then when the bill—at that time we had very few recorded votes—was brought up anyway and passed out on a voice vote, I could not find a way to register my voice as “no” and when they did have a recorded vote, not being able to answer a constituent who might have subsequently asked me, “Well, why did you vote yes?” or “Why did you vote no?” and I not being able to explain, I just voted “present.” And for the first year and a half I was here they called me “Mr. Present.”

Now, today that is taken for granted, and there are several votes on which we will see that orange light lit up during the yea and nay vote, just a Member recording his vote as “present.” I vote that way when I cannot answer exactly why I would vote another way. And that has been a practice of mine, right or wrong.

In this case, I also reflected on the fact that in all of the 9 of 10 volumes of the collected speeches and addresses and writings of President Dwight Eisenhower there is not, and there was not then, one line reflecting the fact that Europe was emerging into what was known as the Common Market or the European Economic Community. And yet my interpretation of the GATT or the Kennedy round or the U.S. Congress' approval of the general agreement of trade and tariff was that it was there because of the realization that Europe was developing this competitive status.

So then, in the 1960's and certainly by the 1970's, the statistics showed me—on my request I obtained these statistics—that whereas the United States had been supplying for the world over 35 percent of food and fiber, Europe soon displaced the United States and the proportion of the European Community was approaching the reduced level of the world share of the United States. So that when I see the continued neglect of these most vital though sometimes they seem to be complex and esoteric, the reality is, my colleagues, that they really are not. These are not things that only a selected handful of geniuses can understand. Yes, if you want to follow all of the gobbledy-gook or what Shakespeare called hyperbole, 3-plied hyperbole, silken terms—imprecise, I would say, rather than precise—yes, if we want that, then, of course, you will be obfuscated because you will be reading obfuscation. But if you look at the plain meaning of simple words, you will find that these matters are not that complex and that each and every one of us should be responsible for a minimal functional ability to discern and therefore evaluate the issues as they are hitting us.

Now, one other thing is that if the Congress is not informed, then the people cannot be either, and the truth of the matter is that the American

people are not informed, and of course we are the delegated agents of the people. Ignorance is no excuse for us and it should not be. But the fact is that if we want to make this a complex area it can become. Anything can.

I remember when I first went to school I did not know a word of English, so I had to stay a whole year in what they used to call the low first. But it was not long before I felt the challenge, mostly inspired by a great public school teacher in the third grade by the name of Miss Mason, and I decided to compete and do the best I could, and I ended up being the spelling champion and later the arithmetic champion. But I remember one teacher, later in high school, when I asked to be given the privilege of taking more than three math courses, and I wanted to take what they called then—I do not know what they call it now—solid geometry, the teacher said, “Well, you have to have a special mind. The trouble with all of these kids going into that class is that the only reasons they are taking it is because they have got to have something, and then after they are in there the teacher has to pass them mostly because of kindness but not because they have learned anything.” And that phrase struck me, “You have to have a special kind of mind.”

Well, I developed into a pretty good mathematician. I ended up studying engineering and went through college. I first studied engineering and then studied law and went to law school. But in engineering, the reason I kind of got sucked into that was because of my fascination with mathematics. And so I had the equivalent of 4 years of college mathematics at that time. Of course, since then we have had such an explosion in knowledge in mathematics and engineering that I would say every one of us would have to go back to school for at least another 4 years.

Nevertheless, the point I am trying to make is that it is not true anymore than in government we have to have a select chosen few to lead us because they know better. The eternal truth is that always mankind has had two general thoughts with respect to that. One holds that there is a saving remnant, in the words of the English writer Matthew Arnold, and then the other is predicated on what I feel is the basic American concept, and that is that the people themselves in the mass and generally are the best judges as to what is best for them. Yes, maybe a leader will emerge who temporarily may seem to be having the answers, but in the long run it has not worked that way. We in the 20th century should be the greatest witnesses to that, and especially now, but certainly after vast world conflagrations, which some of these so-called misbegotten leaders indulge their nations in,

to their catastrophic end, as we are still witnessing, so that when I see that some of these events are not reported to the American people either fully or understandably, such as the recent visit and the address of the British Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher, to this joint body, but particularly her visit with our Chief Executive, President Ronald Reagan, to read our press we would have concluded that the only purpose of Mrs. Thatcher's visit was to pronounce her approval of what has been known as President Ronald Reagan's star wars proposition or the strategic defense instrumentality.

□ 1710

The truth is that that was not even a matter of serious discussion. The headlines were not accurate. Mrs. Thatcher had just prior to that made a visit to Moscow, in which she denounced the concept of the eventual use or deployment of such a thing as whatever it is, is meant by star wars.

What she did tell the President and the American public and us here was that she had nothing against studying the proposition. Research, not development. Research and study. But the most important, impelling reason for her visit was economics; international, and the fact that the United States had reached a point where its leaders in Government, whether the Secretary of the Treasury or the President under this current administration, it appears to be the President. But who in turn appears to be making his decision on the basis of a coterie of very close and intimate advisers, who, in turn, through the years have reflected a very definite philosophy of government that is not exactly democratic.

So that all of that was lost. Then came the trip to the so-called economic summit meeting in Bonn. This year, it was the turn for the West German Government to be the host, as it was in 1979, when President Jimmy Carter made the trip to Bonn for the same purpose. It was one of the first so-called economic summit meetings.

But what is the real purpose? National leaders from these other countries do not make those trips in order to exchange pleasantries; they do not make those trips in order to have the President have the opportunity to put on his boots and ride horseback in Buckingham Palace. They have very definite purposes. Because all the time these nations and their leaders have first and foremost the national interests of their constituencies first and foremost.

In our case, we do not even report to the American people any more than the secret meetings between the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the President of the United States are communicated to the

people. Certainly not to the Congress; much less to the people. Yet, these are of vital significance.

For example, in 1979, as I have been saying here, and, incidentally, and I might say for the record, that the only voice that has even mentioned such things as the ECU, the European currency unit; or the EMS, the European monetary system, has been this voice, in the entire American Congress.

Now, I do not take pride in that; it disturbs me. I am concerned, as I have been very worried; and I have been very worried since 1965, and particularly 1966 and the credit crunch of that year in the summer of 1966. It was self-evident to me that unless our leaders, whether it was in the White House or in the Congress, took cognizance of what was plainly the handwriting on the wall that we were headed for very turbulent and very disastrous involvements.

Money, trade, exchange rates, most of us have a good idea or a fair idea of what money, trade, international trade, exchange rates, international exchange rates, may be a little bit more, what the professors call esoteric. That is, mysterious or not generally understood.

Interest rates. Most of us think we know what we are talking about when we say interest rates. But unless we have occasion to have real need for a line of credit in business, even a \$1,000 or a \$3,000 line of credit for say, a small, small businessman's inventory. Unless you do and realize that you are going to have to work awfully hard and you are going to have to be almost working for the bank that lends you that money, if you have to pay back at a 16-percent, 17-percent, 15-percent, even an 11.5-percent rate. Always through history these were considered usurious, extortionate, illegal.

I am sure that many of my colleagues, and I know many of the citizens that I come into contact with over the years, whether in my own district or in the State or outside of the State, seem to think that there are laws on the books that protect them against usury. When I explain to them that there is no such thing, they cannot quite understand. They say, "When did this happen?"

Well, I have gone into that so many times I will not go into it now. I just want to make the point that money, interest rates, trade, exchange rates all are inseparable. They are like history: A seamless web of economic activity. Interest rates, I have defined. I have not seen an economist define it that way. So I will take full responsibility, as I say I always do, for my words. I believe that any man that is in an activity in which words are the indispensable tool, should be very responsible for every word uttered, and that, I have tried to be. In, as I have

said, 33 years of elective office experience.

So that when I point out that these things are a seamless web, and I have pointed out some of the impact of what we call the external, that is, those things that are happening outside our shores, those forces, whether in Europe or in Japan or in Asia, or in the New World; North and South America. It makes no difference. We now are impacted to such a point that no matter what we do domestically, we can talk all we want to about balancing the budget. We can talk all we want to and we can, through jiggery-pokery say, well, here is a balanced budget or here is a budget resolution that will reduce the deficit. Nobody is even talking any more about a balanced budget. They are talking about reducing a domestic budget forgetting that the really big issue is that international trade and what they call current payments and interest deficit that is costing American jobs every day in the thousands.

We ended up, December 1984 with the most monstrous international trade deficit in the history of any country or combination of countries; \$140 billion. I estimate that for every \$10 billion of that \$140 billion American have lost one-quarter of a million jobs permanently.

When the President was going over to the summit and arrived in Bonn, our newspapers had, some had it front page; some had it in inside pages, the announcement that unemployment had not gone down; that, as a matter of fact, they said it in a reverse sort of a way. It had gone up, but the most significant thing that I never thought under this new, jiggery-pokery way of figuring out the statistics would be admitted to, was that we had a total number of jobs less than before.

□ 1720

I am sure this had an impact in Europe because the President was going over to say how Reaganomics had brought prosperity, but at the same time, the week before, the Vice Chairman, or the equivalent of the Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Preston Martin, in weasel words was saying we have now a depression in recovery, we have a depressed recovery. I have never heard a more contradictory use of words than that one. I marveled at the Vice Chairman's use of words.

What he was saying was that now you cannot hide the fact. The so-called Reagan recovery, which I have said all along was a delusion, the so-called control of inflation. Where has inflation been deflated? In the basic cost of living? Have rents gone down? Are they deflated? What I read is that they go up constantly, and I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing

and Community Development, so I think I ought to know these statistics.

Has the price of groceries gone down? Are we paying less for groceries? Well, I will tell you that I would have a hard time, as I did when the colleagues from the other side were boasting about a recovery and inflation having been controlled, I defy them to go home and explain to my wife where the groceries have gone down; in fact, prove that they had not gone up.

The truth is that when it comes to the basic cost of living, we are in a constant and an inflationary situation. Wages, and the median average wages received by American workers, have gone down, not stabilized. It is less than it was in 1981, certainly less than it was in 1975, and this was when we were coming out of the then so-called dip or recession.

The significant thing is that at the bottom of this is this question of interest rates. I define interest as that mechanism by virtue of which wealth is transferred within a society. This fact was known as far back as 7,000 years before Christ, in the Code of Hammurabi. We read absolute, strict prohibitions on what we define as usury. At the time of Jesus Christ himself, usury was punishable, in certain areas by death.

So all through history that particular force which we call interest rates is something that has had to be controlled, and the reason is simple. The reason we have government is that those forces in our human existence that would destroy others needed the control of the collective defense of the people. This is why we have government. If government ceases to protect the people in their personal safety, and we have areas in our country today, I have some in my district that I have gone to the grand jury since 1970 because of the fear in which entire neighborhoods have lived and with no adequate police protection, that is, no State protection, no governmental assurance that they are safe in life and limb in their own homes.

These things do not occur happenstance. There are causes, and the basic cause, for most if not every one of the maladjustments we read about are predicated on the extortionate, sinful, I say criminal interest rates that have flagellated America now for quite a few years unbelievably. In 1966, when I first addressed a letter to the then President of the United States, I did not get much attention because interest rates were not much over 6 percent and nobody seemed to think that there was any reason to be concerned. It was to no avail that I reminded my colleagues then, and the President, that there was no force that would be around to prevent an inordinate increase. I remember the chairman of

the full Committee on Banking then saying, "Henry, you are overexercised. I cannot see interest rates ever going even as high as 7 percent." Well, I am sure he has turned over in his grave 50 times since 1980 when the prime interest rate went to 21 percent.

Now, what happened in the interval? The statistics are a sorry, sorry story. We have had as great or a greater number of businesses go broke, disappear, than ever since the depression. Our international trade balance, which means jobs to America, permanent jobs have been lost. For the first time, as of 1984, since Teddy Roosevelt's days, the United States is a debtor nation. We were not and had not been since about 1914. As a matter of fact, when Teddy Roosevelt did bring about the construction of the Panama Canal after the French failure, we had to go to Paris, France, to get the capital, about \$40 million, in order to be able to construct the canal.

We are now a debtor nation for the first time since 1914, but more importantly, we are back in what I say is the equivalent of what was happening during the time of the American Revolution, and one of the basic reasons for the American Revolution was the mercantile system, where the colonies were supposed to be the dumping ground, the consumer, and any kind of manufactured article or goods would have to come from the mother country at a price that was so high that it finally led to revolution. American merchants and beginning manufacturers could not see why, with the use of the materials that we were sending to the mother country, that we, ourselves, could not manufacture, although in the beginning they may have been of a little bit more inferior quality, at about one-tenth of the price of what was having to be paid for this imported goods from the mother country.

We are in that situation now with respect to Europe. As I have pointed out, in 1979, the communique that came out of the economic summit meeting of 1979, the last sentence of that communique, I doubt that anybody in the general public or in the Congress paid attention to it, but it had one significant sentence. It said the signatories agreed to the development of the ECU, the European currency unit, and the EMS, the European monetary system.

Even though everything we read about President Reagan's trip to the Bonn economic summit meeting earlier this month had to do with the controversy about the visit to Bitburg, and then the big headline on the Sunday at the conclusion of the conference that France single handedly had not agreed to go along with what—with some vaguely reported trade agreements as to free trade and the like, and that kind of stuff.

But the real thing, as I reported to my colleagues in the RECORD before the summit meeting, late last month and the first week of this month, was that the finance ministers of the Group of 6 or Group of 10, depending on what you want to call the real powers of the European Community had had a meeting.

□ 1730

I am the only one that I know that reported this meeting, either in the American press or, much less, to the Congress, and that was that on April 13 and April 14, in Palermo, Sicily, the finance ministers of these six countries met and agreed to carry out the agreement they had reached sometime before April 13 and April 14 in Basel, Switzerland. And that was to put real significance and meaning into the European currency unit and to, therefore, put life into the European monetary system in order to decouple Western Europe from the U.S. economy.

Now, at the Palermo meeting the six ministers definitely decided to convert the ECU [European currency unit] into an international reserve instrument to compete with the dollar. The ECU, in short, is the accounting unit for the European currencies. Their collateral action taken with respect to the EMS [European monetary system] was to provide for the first expansion of EMS, which would allow non-European central banks to hold ECU's [European currency units] which means then that the dollar is done in as the international currency unit.

What does that mean to us? Well, I think we have to go back and see what the catastrophic and monstrous international trade deficit has already done to us. The report that we saw the same day the President left for Bonn was that unemployment in effect, they were saying, has increased. It has not gone down any, and the President's story about how many jobs had been produced was fallacious; it was in error. We have lost jobs, most of them permanently, because of the fact that we have become a consumer, not a producing nation.

Who would have thought, for instance, that the American machine tool industry was in such a state of de-function as was presented to us in the Small Business Committee early last year by one of the spokesmen for the American machine tool industry? Well, let us see why. Designs for machine tools come from abroad, the parts are made in several countries, they are assembled in several others, and then the United States markets them with brand name firms. What that means is that all those jobs which we used to have in our machine tool industry, which used to be the leader, the pride of the world—this was what Franklin Roosevelt called the "arsenal

of democracy" during World War II—are gone.

Another item is research and development. Pratt & Whitney joined Rolls Royce. For what? For new engine technology.

The almost totally nationalized nation of France signed agreements with 17 universities in our country to research robotics and the so-called artificial intelligence, and, therefore, France now has outcompeted us in such things as satellite communication, in which we were first, in which we had initial leadership until this year. France's and West Germany's imports into the United States just in 6 months of last year, the last 6 months, increased incrementally 20 percent. AT&T, ITT, and IBM compete for hookup with foreign firms, with Japan's Nippon Telephone and Telegraphic and Italy's Olivetti on their terms.

The reason? Again we go back to that old devil, interest rates.

Why are the S&L's in Ohio and, after that, in Maryland, in trouble? And there is one other State that has this kind of unique, S&L, State-initiated, State-supported, ostensibly State-regulated system. What is the condition of what we call our regular S&L's? Well, I would say at this point that over 70 percent of them are in serious trouble.

Why is that? Why does it appear to have happened all of a sudden? We have been trying to address this issue since 1966, and very specifically since the 1970's, and more specifically just 3 years ago, in 1982, when the Congress approved what now is called the Garn-St Germain bill, which was supposed to be almost exclusively for the purpose of saving the S&L's then.

I had the very distasteful lot to appear before the Rules Committee in opposition to my chairman, whom I respect highly and of whom I am glad to be a loyal supporter, as the ranking member of the Banking Committee. But why did I do so? Because in that bill Congress was enabled to really seal their fate. We no longer have a savings and loan system in our country.

Savings and loans were especially created along about 1940 for the purpose of housing Americans, constructing homes, and enabling Americans to purchase those homes at affordable prices through the use of a special credit allocation mechanism known as a savings and loan. They had certain privileges and subsidies that set them apart. But then came the advent of the money manias of the 1970's and the 1980's, the so-called real estate investment trusts, which today are one prime cause of this instability of the S&L's but which are now a demon because, instead of the old REIT's, the real estate investment trusts that were the scandals 10 years ago that were in

the private area, now they have mixed in the Government through the Government securities speculative markets, and we are really facing real, real serious problems and dilemmas, with nobody that I know specifically addressing the issue except as a post mortem—like after the Penn Square failure in Oklahoma and the Continental Illinois.

I do not know what any responsible Member of this Congress or any American leader is waiting for, but we have now more than the handwriting. We had the handwriting on the wall, as I saw it, in 1966. What we have now is the fulfillment of a rather direful and sorrowful prediction that we so unhappily felt compelled to make in the 1960's, the 1970's, and later in the 1980's. And what we have is this: We have the taxpayer investing \$6 billion in order to save the Continental Illinois but in effect nationalizing the bank. We like to think that does not happen in the United States, that happens in other countries, that we do not nationalize. But we in effect did.

But look at the sorrowful tale. Even the post mortem here I deplore. I feel that we do not need post mortems unless they can lead to actions. Rather than post mortem actions, I like anticipatory actions. This is what I have been advocating, because not only have I been pointing out dangers and problems and deplored situations, I have offered specific suggestions by way of legislative proposals and other suggestions. I am on the record on that, and this is the reason I am on the record today, because, as I see it, we are on the verge of a teetering situation that we should anticipate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

□ 1740

INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WASTE LIABILITY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing important legislation which establishes liability and indemnification for nuclear incidents arising out of Federal storage, disposal, and transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel. This bill amends the Price-Anderson Act to ensure that the Federal Government, through its Federal contractors, assumes responsibility to provide total indemnification for public liability claims resulting from nuclear waste disposal activities.

The original cosponsors of this legislation are: NORMAN DICKS, ROD CHANDLER, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, HARRY

REID, BEAU BOULTER, and LARRY COMBEST.

This bill, "The Federal Nuclear Waste Disposal Liability Act of 1985," addresses a troubling concern voiced by the States now involved in the site selection process for disposal of high-level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel. That concern simply expressed is: "Who has liability in the event of an accident and for how much?" While most authorities acknowledge only the remote risk of a nuclear waste incident resulting in substantial damages, that risk is ever present and is a driving force in any negotiations on nuclear waste. This is why we need to resolve the nuclear waste liability issue now as the affected States and the Federal Government work together to make the critical decisions on site selection.

However, the current laws governing nuclear waste and nuclear liability matters—the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Price-Anderson Act of 1957 as amended—do not clearly settle who is responsible for such nuclear waste incidents and to what extent. The bill I am introducing today is intended to clarify this ambiguity by putting the brunt of the responsibility where it belongs—squarely on the Federal Government.

My bill accomplishes this objective by making two fundamental statutory changes.

First, the Price-Anderson Act is amended to eliminate the current \$500 million liability ceiling for those Federal contractors engaged in nuclear waste disposal activities. With the existing liability cap, those parties injured from incidents related to the disposal of nuclear waste could not recover directly more than \$500 million under the Price-Anderson mechanism. This limited notion of liability is an anathema to the States and other affected parties. The liability cap has become one of the major roadblocks threatening to sidetrack cooperation between the affected States and the Federal Government in the site selection process. In my mind, it is irresponsible for the Federal Government not to accept unlimited liability when they are taking title to spent nuclear fuel, managing its storage and disposal, and selecting and siting permanent repository sites.

Second, the bill sets up a two-tier system for payment of liability claims. The initial source for payment of liability claims—up to \$5 billion—will be the nuclear waste trust fund established in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. This fund, which can be adjusted accordingly, represents a ready pool of cash for paying claims. The fund is the appropriate source for payment of initial liability claims since it is essentially a user fee made up of revenues received from the generators of high-level nuclear waste. The second compensation tier for those li-

ability claims in excess of \$5 billion will be general Federal revenues.

I hope this legislation and other good-faith efforts to resolve the liability question will be a symbol of the continuing willingness of the Federal Government and the affected States to work out in a cooperative fashion potential areas of conflict and disagreement. For if the cooperation between the various entities—a hallmark of the act—is lost, the complete unravelling of the nuclear waste site selection process is not far behind.

A section-by-section summary of the bill as well as a copy of the legislation follow:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF NUCLEAR WASTE LIABILITY BILL

SECTION 1.—SHORT TITLE

The bill is called "The Federal Nuclear Waste Disposal Liability Act of 1985".

SECTION 2.—FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The Congress finds that the Federal Government currently does not, but should, assume the responsibility to provide total indemnification for public liability claims arising out of nuclear waste disposal activities, including interim storage, transportation, and ultimate repository disposal. The Congress also finds that such indemnification should in part be paid out the Nuclear Waste Fund which consists of revenues obtained on a ratable basis from the generators of high-level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel.

The purpose of this Act is to amend the Price-Anderson Act to ensure that the federal government assumes the responsibility to provide, in part through the use of the Nuclear Waste Fund, total indemnification for public liability claims resulting from nuclear waste disposal activities.

SECTION 3.—FEDERAL NUCLEAR WASTE LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION

A new paragraph (2) is added to Section 170d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(d)) which mandates that:

(a) the Secretary of energy shall enter into indemnification agreements with all federal contractors carrying out nuclear waste disposal activities outlined in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982;

(b) in these nuclear waste federal contractor indemnification agreements, there shall be no cap on the amount of liability for which the federal government is responsible; and

(c) such payments required under the indemnification agreements shall be paid from amounts available in the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, except that the amount available from the fund shall not exceed \$5 billion per incident. Liability amounts in excess of \$5 billion will be provided directly from general federal revenues.

Finally, the bill amends section 170n(1)(c) of the Atomic Energy Act so that the waiver of defenses available for extraordinary nuclear occurrences are also applicable to those activities related to the disposal of nuclear byproduct material.

H.R. 2524

A bill to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish liability and indemnification for nuclear incidents arising out of Federal storage, disposal, or related transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "The Federal Nuclear Waste Disposal Liability Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government currently does not, but should, assume the responsibility to provide total indemnification for public liability claims arising out of nuclear incidents relating to Federal storage, disposal, and related transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel; and

(2) such indemnification should be made in part from amounts available through the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) to ensure that the Federal Government assumes the responsibility to provide, in part through the use of the Nuclear Waste Fund, total indemnification for public liability claims arising out of nuclear incidents relating to Federal storage, disposal, and related transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL NUCLEAR WASTE LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION.

(a) LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION FOR ACTIVITIES UNDER NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1982.—Section 170 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) (A) The Secretary of Energy shall enter into agreements of indemnification with each contractor of the Secretary carrying out contractual activities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.).

"(B) In such agreements of indemnification, the Secretary of Energy shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection e., indemnify the persons indemnified against claims for public liability for nuclear incidents arising out of or in connection with contractual activities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.), including the storage, disposal, and related transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.

"(C) The Secretary of Energy shall make any payments required under an agreement of indemnification entered into under this paragraph from amounts available through the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222), except that the aggregate amount of payments made from amounts available through the Nuclear Waste Fund shall not exceed \$5,000,000,000 in connection with each nuclear incident."

(b) APPLICABILITY OF WAIVER OF DEFENSES REQUIREMENT TO LIABILITY FOR FEDERAL NUCLEAR WASTE ACTIVITIES.—Section

170n.(1)(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2210(n)(1)(c)) is amended by striking out "a device utilizing".

SOCIAL SECURITY COLA'S SHOULD NOT BE ELIMINATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BURTON] is recognized for 10 minutes. ● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I was deeply disturbed that the President decided to retreat from his promise not to reduce Social Security benefits. The budget resolution passed by the other body, and supported by President Reagan, eliminates Social Security COLA's for 1 year. According to the Congressional Budget Office, over 600,000 senior citizens would fall below the poverty line as a result of such an action. We cannot let that happen.

In our efforts to reduce the deficit, there are those who have spoken forcefully against any cuts in defense spending. Yesterday, our colleague Les ASPIN informed us that defense spending has been overestimated by \$9 billion. I think it is clear that we could hold down defense spending without weakening our national defense. The same is not true for Social Security cuts. Hundreds of thousands of people will suffer from such an action. Our elderly and disabled populations are least able to bear the financial burden of the President's deficit reduction plans.

LEGISLATION TO ACCELERATE PUBLIC RELEASE OF PROCEEDINGS OF INVESTIGATION OF ASSASSINATIONS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues from the former House Select Committee on Assassinations [SCOA] and many other Members to introduce a bill to accelerate the public release of the proceedings of the committee's investigation into the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The release of these carefully screened documents will complete the job the committee originally set out to do—shed light on all aspects of the assassinations and put to rest public speculation on these tragic events.

Because of time and funding constraints, the select committee did not meet to oversee the release of its records after submitting the final report on its findings, and the records became embargoed for 50 years in accordance with House tradition. Our

resolution simply would direct the Clerk of the House to permit the Archivist of the United States to release, for public use, the committee proceedings, in accordance with the intent of the committee.

The proceedings of the Select Committee on Assassinations currently are the only collection of investigatory records on the Kennedy and King cases which have not been reviewed and released for public access. Over 90 percent of the proceeding of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, better known as the Warren Commission, have been available for years to scholars, historians, journalists, and the interested public. These records were made available by a special direction of President Johnson which waived the 75-year National Archives holding rule. My colleagues and I believe that the House of Representatives should show the same respect for open government and freedom of information and begin the release of appropriate Select Committee on Assassinations' records.

I can assure my colleagues that sensitive material would not be made public under this resolution, as it explicitly adopts guidelines used by the National Archives for processing the Warren Commission's records. These guidelines prevent the release of information that:

Would be detrimental to enforcement of U.S. law; might reveal the identity of confidential sources or jeopardize future investigations; or might embarrass innocent individuals.

This resolution also prohibits the release of records from any proceedings that the committee voted to keep secret or where confidentiality was guaranteed to a witness in executive session. The committee had strict and explicit rules regarding the designation and segregation of classified material, and these rules would be honored, without exception.

Last session, a similar resolution (H. Res. 160) was reviewed by the full Committee on House Administration. The suggestions made by the committee at that time have been incorporated into the resolution I am now introducing. In response to concerns raised, authority to disapprove the release of any record will remain with the Clerk of the House, who is directed to apply the standards established by the Warren Commission. This session's resolution also exempts records inconsistent with the privileges of the House from release, so as not to prejudice the House as an institution.

The opening up of these important documents would serve two purposes: It would assist those with a scholarly or personal interest in the lives of these two men; and it would allow the public to assess the performance and

conclusions of the Select Committee on Assassinations. I believe that the unique nature of this committee lends itself to a special consideration of the benefits of making these proceedings public, without jeopardizing those who testified under guarantee of confidentiality.

Finally, I hardly need to remind my colleagues that President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., both were eloquent advocates of honest government and the value of an educated citizenry. Passing this resolution and releasing the records of the Select Committee on Assassinations would be a most worthy testament to the ideals for which these two men stood. ●

DASH TO MANAGUA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and those who are watching this program, I would like to introduce an item that was published in today's Washington Post. It is an editorial by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. It is entitled "Dash to Managua."

This editorial is disturbing. It is disturbing for reasons that are both constitutional and political. It is disturbing for reasons that are also related to the safety of the United States of America.

The constitutional question involves the Logan Act, the idea that the President and the executive branch makes foreign policy.

The political question involves the idea that Members of Congress are conducting foreign policy with a government hostile to the United States of America. Let me just read a little bit from this editorial today:

No sooner had President Daniel Ortega flown off to Moscow than two Democratic congressmen arrived in Managua for the weekend to plead, according to U.S. diplomatic cables, for help from the Marxist-Leninist regime in calming the congressional uproar over the Nicaraguan's telltale trip.

I ask you, what in the world are two Members of the United States House of Representatives doing in Managua, Nicaragua, pleading for help on a sensitive political issue from government leaders with expressed hostility to the Government of the United States?

Representatives GEORGE MILLER of California and DAVID BONIOR of Michigan, I might add, two individuals for whom I have respect and whose patriotism I do not question, going on with the quote:

Reps. George Miller of California and David Bonior of Michigan say "no comment" on their "private conversations" with Sandinista leaders, from which U.S. Embassy officials were excluded. But cables reporting on their talks have surfaced on Capitol Hill, where we obtained them. They de-

scribe the congressmen as making the trip to "see what the [Nicaraguan] government could do to help them out of a difficult political situation in the House."

Again, one has to ask the question, what in the world are two Democratic—or any Members of this House of Representatives—doing asking a Marxist-Leninist dictatorship for assistance in helping them to solve a difficult political situation in the House?

An unnamed member of the congressional delegation is quoted as advising Foreign Ministry officials that the regime should try and hold out for three more years because things back in Washington might radically change by then, meaning a new administration in power. Departing from his "no comment" rule, Miller told us that no such statements were made.

I think we have to question those kinds of comments. For two U.S. Congressmen to essentially hold out hope that in another political time, at another political day this Marxist-Leninist Soviet-backed regime would receive a much more favorable review from the administration, supposedly I guess a Democratic administration at that point in the future, I think is ludicrous.

As a matter of fact, I am outraged. I think the American people are outraged.

Going back to the article:

A House Democratic leader, who did not want his name used, said he was "uncomfortable" that their weekend in Managua brought Miller-Bonior "dangerously close to negotiations."

The Logan Act expressly prohibits the carrying on of foreign policy by citizens outside of the executive branch. It states as follows:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States—

And I would suspect that the authority of the United States is referring to either the President or perhaps a Presidential congressional mandate—

directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Now, I think these gentlemen, whom I respect, are perilously close to violating the Logan Act, if not having already violated it.

Going back to the Evans and Novak article, it states:

But beyond the impropriety of congressmen playing diplomat is a grosser spectacle: a symbiotic relationship between American politicians and the Nicaraguan dictatorship.

Miller and Bonior dashed off to Managua as many Democratic colleagues fretted over Ortega's mission to Moscow immediately after the House vetoed any aid to anti-Sandinista guerrillas.

Now, I am not sure whether they fretted over Ortega's visit to Moscow and his intimate relations with the Soviet Union or whether they fretted over Ortega's timing.

Frankly, I would hope and I would suspect that most Members of this House fretted over the fact that we had just turned down \$14 million in nonlethal assistance to the democratic—with a small "d"—forces fighting the Marxist-Leninists in Nicaragua and Ortega the next day is off to collect \$200 million from his Soviet allies, including not only economic aid but heavy equipment and hardware and the kind of things that most certainly can be characterized as military aid. In any event, we do not know the details of the \$200 million agreement and Mr. Ortega or Mr. Ortega's if not supporters in this Congress, those who voted against his opponents, have certainly not stated what is in that \$200 million aid package.

□ 1750

Miller was accompanied by a staffer, Cynthia Arnson, "a prominent champion of the Sandinistas." I am quoting the Evans and Novak column. "... formerly employed by the" according to Evans and Novak, "left-wing Institute for Policy Studies."

I am going on to another paragraph in the article. It says, "In a departure from tradition but true to the latest fashion of pro-Sandinista Congressmen, U.S. Embassy officials were barred from the meetings."

For the life of me I cannot understand how in discussions with a hostile foreign power our own Members of this House are barring our own public service diplomats who are on the scene in this area.

"Miller informed the Embassy he had told Ramirez," Sergio Ramirez is the Vice President, "that he had told Ramirez the regime would have to ease censorship and allow what were termed democratic activities to keep the support of Democrats in Washington."

You know, I think we have to be careful here. I am all for substantive changes that conform to the promises that the Sandinistas made to the Organization of American States. I am all for those kinds of democratic, small "d," promises that the Sandinistas made to their own people in coming to power in 1979.

But I have to seriously question cosmetic changes that somehow are designed to gain 3 years of breathing space until a new administration is in Washington.

But reports from Nicaraguan sources, as reflected in tables being read on Capitol Hill, suggested the Congressmen were less interested in liberalization for its own sake than in getting themselves off the political hook back home.

One well placed source had the Congressmen warning that unless the Nicaraguan Government took steps toward pluralism, Congressional Democrats would switch and vote aid for the Contras. It was a second such source that quoted the Congressmen asking the Sandinistas to "help them out of a difficult political situation."

We, the Representatives of the American people, are interested in a pluralistic democratic Nicaragua that is not a threat to its neighbors, that will not destabilize the region, that is not flying off after a favorable vote in the United States Congress to gain \$200 million in assistance from our Soviet adversaries. That is what we are interested in.

We are not interested in cosmetic changes to "help us out of a difficult political situation."

"The one meeting Embassy officials attended was with Jaime Chamorro, editor of the anti-Sandinista *La Prensa*. Miller told the embattled newspaperman that he had urged on government officials the necessity of freedom of the press. Chamorro was not impressed. *La Prensa* would not accept a separate agreement with the government, he said, insisting that freedom of the press must be part of a national 'dialog.'"

Again, the conflict between cosmetic changes to help U.S. Congressmen out of a political jam, and substantive changes designed to promote a free, open, and democratic and pluralistic Nicaragua.

"The MILLER-BONIOR weekend in Managua follows a pattern."

I will not mention Members of the other body, but two Democratic Members of the other body conferred with Ortega in Managua before the House vote. " * * * they not only barred U.S. diplomats but did not even report to them after the fact, as MILLER and BONIOR did." And I commend my colleagues for at least reporting back to their own Government officials.

"The Sandinista regime's offer to send 100—out of 2,000—Cubans back home followed secret negotiations not with U.S. diplomats but with congressional staffers."

I am sorry, but the way I look at it, congressional staffers should not be negotiating with hostile foreign powers. I frankly do not believe, and I do not think the American people believe either that U.S. Congressman separately should be negotiating with hostile foreign powers. Congressional staffers are to give information and provide research, and to do leg work for Congressmen. They are not to act as diplomats.

"The pattern may be breaking," it goes on to say in the Evans and Novak article, "partly because freelance congressional diplomacy is stirring bipartisan distaste, Bernard Aronson, a Democratic insider and campaign adviser to Geraldine Ferraro last fall, writes in the current New Republic

that his party should promise military support for the armed democratic resistance if all other efforts fail. That advice is the antithesis of Democrats, pursuing cosmetic Sandinista 'pluralism' while urging the comandantes to hang tough until the next American Presidential election."

I think what is at stake here is something much broader than this one incident. Aside from the conduct of American foreign policy in some reasonably unified fashion, what is at stake is the future of the Democratic Party.

Since the defeat of Mr. Mondale in the fall elections, a variety of Democrats have been holding meetings, conducting seminars, speaking publicly and amongst themselves on how to move their party back into the mainstream of American politics, how to move their party back into the broad center of American politics that wins national elections, that wins Presidential elections. These discussions have focused in many cases on the economy and the management of the economy and how Democrats must cease to be perceived, and really must cease to be simply the voice of fractionated special interest groups seeking their own advantage in Washington, DC.

These discussions have ranged to defense policy and to foreign policy. I can think of no greater symbol of the continuing dominance of a fringe element in democratic foreign policy than this recent vote in the House on the denial of assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua and the subsequent reaction of those who stimulated the defeat in the wake of the Ortega visit to Moscow.

I urge my democratic colleagues, who I believe are similarly outraged by this disintegration of the foreign policy process in this country, to atone for the transgression, to see the handwriting on the wall, and when the next opportunity arises to speak on behalf of the forces of democracy in Central America.

□ 1800

Also to do something about promoting those forces in the form of assistance, that they would vote to provide that assistance, and not only help the forces of freedom in this hemisphere, the security of the United States, but their own party as well. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John F. Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Henry Jackson are watching.

Mr. Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed under special orders for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO INTER-PARLIAMENTARY EXCHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I take this time to inform the Members of the House that under the law we have established an interparliamentary exchange between the United States and Mexico wherein Parliamentarians from our country, both House and Senate, meet with our counterparts in the Mexican Congress. That occurs one year in the United States and the next year in Mexico.

This exchange was initiated 25 years ago and the initial exchange or meeting was held in Guadalajara, Talisco, Mexico, 25 years ago. We have just returned from Mexico City where we arrived for this meeting. Now, although the meeting was held in the city of Queretaro, State of Queretaro, Mexico, I must say, and not because I was the leader for the House delegation—and, by the way, my colleague from Texas, Senator PHIL GRAMM, led the Senate delegation—I must say that I think it has been one of the most successful meetings that we have had. Although it is of short duration, only 2½ days, we held three sessions of 3 to 4 hours, and one went about 5 hours, of sessions.

We discussed all of the issues that impact upon our relations as two neighboring countries, as two friendly countries. I must say that I think for the first time the discussions were spontaneous, a general back and forth discussion, rather than just reading position papers on one side or the other.

We were received in the inaugural session, and this is very interesting and prior to that let me go back into a bit of history of the area: The State of Queretaro and the city of Queretaro are almost the equivalent in the Mexican independence movements as what Philadelphia and Boston were to our independence movement.

It was there in the city of Queretaro that the plot, if you can call it that, of the independence movement was discovered by the Spanish forces who then occupied Mexico, and a lady, Josefa Ortiz de Domínguez, was the one that gave the signal or sounded the alarm to the Mexican independence forces that the plot had been discovered, and that initiated the fighting part of the independence movement, not too distant, in a village called Dolores Hidalgo. This is in

effect what Paul Revere had done on our side when he came through the countryside announcing that the British were coming and the ensuing battles that were to follow, and he gave the signal.

Also there in Queretaro was the culmination of the French occupation of Mexico.

Not too many days ago I spoke about the battle of Puebla which is where the Mexican troops defeated the French troops and began the final process of eliminating the French rule over Mexico. But it was at Queretaro that they finally captured Archduke Maximilian who had been declared Emperor of Mexico. He was executed at a small hill near Queretaro. This was of interest, I think, to us here because of all of the Americas we were the first to declare independence from a foreign sovereign, which was Great Britain. But at Queretaro, with the execution of Maximilian, that ended the reign of the European designs for any of the Americas. This was the last of the European sovereigns to reign in the Americas. Maximilian, along with two Mexicans who had supported his endeavor, were executed there. So with that background we met not too far from the city of Queretaro and we discussed narcotics traffic, its use, its abuse, its control, in depth. We reached agreement on a resolution committing ourselves and our countries to a more forceful fight of narcotics traffic, use, abuse, and control, for its control. We discussed the Law of the Sea which to many of our areas is important, areas in the West with tuna fishing concerns, in the gulf with its shrimping off Mexican waters, where we have had problems not only because of the Law of the Sea but territorial expansion, both ours and theirs.

We discussed, of course, border problems. We have 2,000 miles of border between the United States and Mexico. We discussed those in depth. There is always the Rio Grande which is part of the boundary; Texas, the rest of the boundary, New Mexico, Arizona, into California.

We discussed environmental impact on the border. There are mines, smelting mines on either side of the border, there are problems in Mexico, more in Mexico than on our side, with respect to discharges of waters into the area of Tijuana, or down in Texas, that impact upon the quality of the water. We discussed border crossings, that traffic that we on our side would like to have more crossings to facilitate commerce and tourism.

□ 1810

I might add that Mexico's reply was that—and I can sympathize with that, that they have monetary problems, not only opening up a border crossing, but the staffing for customs, immigra-

tion, public health, agriculture, entails a lot of finances, and not all of that is recouped from charges that you might make for those who cross back and forth.

So we discussed that in depth, and particular crossings that we would like to have in my congressional district, and in adjoining districts. My home town of Mission, the city of Pharr, the city of Donna, Harlingen, San Benito.

We discussed all of those in depth, and what could we do together? How could one complement the other? We had extensive discussions related to our involvement in the Americas, both Mexico and us, in Central America, Salvador, Nicaragua in particular. We have some mutual concerns which are equal. We have some concerns that are not alike. We have some basic philosophy which is not similar in some areas to Mexico, but in the end, we resolved that we are all aiming for the same final conclusion; which would be peace, freedom, justice, equality, prosperity for the people of the individual nations of Central America and South America.

It was a very interesting, very forceful and frank conversation because there are some valid, in-depth disagreements as to our concept as to what entails internal security and what entails protection of a basic territorial security.

The leader of the Mexican delegation for the House was Lic. Humberto Lugo Gil and for the Mexican Senate was former Ambassador to Washington Hugo B. Margin, who is now a member of the senate in Mexico.

In the beginning of the inaugural session, as I stated, we were received by the President of Mexico, Miguel de la Madrid, who came to our initial opening ceremony to open the session, which to us was very important and, of course, an honor and distinction that the President of the great Republic of Mexico would come out of Mexico City to begin the sessions that we were to continue for several days after.

He welcomed us, and pronounced some of the desires and intentions of Mexico, for their people, their relations to us, and to the rest of the hemisphere. It was a very impressive ceremony because with him were his Secretary of State, Bernardo Sepulveda, and they have a different Cabinet post that we do not have; it translates as Ministry of Interior. They call it "Gobernacion."

That Cabinet post is basically what we know as the upper echelon of the White House. The White House Chief of Staff, and the Executive Office of the Presidency, that is what "Gobernacion" or Interior Ministry would be in Mexico. He is of Cabinet rank.

Also we were received by the Governor of the state of Coahuila and the mayor of the city of Queretaro—the Governor of the state of Queretaro;

not Coahuila, and the mayor of the city of Queretaro, and several of the mayors of the surrounding villages and small towns in that area.

We also were able to visit the surrounding countryside. Let me tell you that some people say that these visits are junkets; that you go off and have a good time.

Well, we managed to do both, because we would work all morning and then have a nice luncheon at a beautiful hacienda. In the evening after a late session they would honor us with a beautiful dinner. We had one of the most beautiful experiences that I have ever had in that Saturday evening, prior to the conclusion of the session, we were invited to the city of Queretaro where we were received by the populace of Queretaro in their main plaza. The whole town came out to greet us and to those of you that may not be acquainted, the Mexican towns are laid out in the old Spanish tradition, where there is a center plaza, or square with the cathedral or the church on one side, the municipal authorities on another side, the military compound on another side—this is a traditional Spanish Colonial or Mexican center plaza, or downtown square.

Well, this evening we walked right into the entire population of Queretaro almost, greeting us and wanting to touch and say hello and greet us, and then the cathedral—or church, I really do not know if it is a cathedral—but the Catholic church was all lit up in one of the most beautiful sights that you would want to see or experience.

Then they had a fireworks display from the ceiling of the church that looked fire was just raining down in front of that beautiful edifice. It was one of the most thrilling experiences, I assure you, any one of us have ever experienced or witnessed.

Then off to one side they had this beautiful fireworks that they do in Mexico—they rig a bamboo into a beautiful structure, that you cannot see it when it is in the dark, but then it lights up with wheels that turn and fireworks that shoot out, and then—in the colors; red, white, and blue and green, white and red, then both flags light up and then it says "Welcome, Parliamentarians, U.S. and Mexico."

If you can visualize that against a dark sky, lit up in all the beautiful colors with fireworks with the twisting, making a whistling sound, wheels at all of the extremes—and we were there in the plaza with the people of Queretaro, looking and observing that.

It sort of adds substance to your work, that you are able to visualize something like that. It was indeed a beautiful experience. While the bells of the church were ringing, at the same time.

Then the—this is an area of basic Indian population, and the leaders of the Indian tribes of that area came to do their dances and perform for us, and to each member of the delegation, of the leaders of the delegation, they presented us with one of their shields, that are made of feathers, of canary feathers and ostrich feathers—I guess any kind of feathered animal or bird that they gave this beautiful shield and welcome us on behalf of the Indian population of that area.

□ 1820

It was, to me, very exciting. And the connection that we have with our basic native Americans and to Mexico, which has probably more history before than ours, all pre-Colombian, and there were the different tribes there that evening to do the dances with us or for us, led by the Governor of the state and the different mayors of the area.

We continued with our meetings. We discussed anxieties, migrant workers, undocumented or illegals, whichever way you would want to call them. Mexicans presented their viewpoint as to the integrity of the individual. Basically, they have a different concept than we do as to the integrity, territorial integrity, because their position is that a human creature of God has a basic inherent right to travel.

We know that in a civilized world, where you have territorial integrity, you do not just have people coming and going. The people themselves call themselves Mexican or Argentinian or French or Italian, the people themselves designate what their basic territorial group is. So we have a difference there, but we do not have a difference that the individual is deserving of the protection of the law and should be treated as a creature of God, which we observe in this country nonetheless. Regardless of whether they are here legally or illegally, they come under the cloak of the Constitution and receive all of the protections afforded by law. But this is, to them, a very important factor.

We also discussed the monetary problems, world monetary problems, how they impact upon us here in the United States, how they impact upon Mexico, how trade and commerce between us and third countries impact on one or the other and the areas of concern, the areas of agreement, the areas of possible cooperation, and I assure you that this was a very fruitful, constructive discussion.

For many of us who live on the border and who know the situation, we live with it. But for some of our colleagues not from the border, it is very helpful to know that what we could do here, even without thinking, could have a very negative impact on Mexico economically or monetarily. So it is for us to be concerned, which we are,

as to the stability of the economy of Mexico, and they are, after Japan, our next best customer and we of them. We buy a tremendous amount of Mexican oil and gas, and a lot of the other things that Mexico has to sell in foreign commerce with us, and this is a very critical area both for our side and their side because we have a tremendous deficit, we have a horrendous debt. Just paying interest on the debt takes a large share of our budget and impacts on our deficit every year. They have an external debt, which is very critical, of some \$80 billion, and it is very critical because they need foreign earnings, they need dollars to come into Mexico to pay out in dollars to the banks, to Europe and here, and to our Government or the Monetary Fund, whomever they owe the money, both the public debt and the private debt. They need the foreign earnings, otherwise to pay in pesos would be devastating. They have had a very difficult time.

In my inaugural talk in the inaugural session I commended the President of Mexico and my Mexican colleagues and the people because they have, to the best of their ability, grasped the situation and they are making headway by an austerity program where they are reducing expenditures and then increasing income by increasing revenues either through higher prices for items or taxes and a combination, and this would be very interesting to us and those who deal in that area that they said, "You can't balance your budget or reduce your inflation or reduce your debts solely by decreases, but you have to combine some with decreasing and some with increasing revenue, if necessary taxes." And I would commend that to those who work with the budget on our side of the border. But they have basically been successful in slowly reducing inflation and reducing their deficit. They have been more successful in reducing their deficit than we have been. And for this we commend them, and we are trying to do on our side, of course, our share. But this was a very interesting and, for me, a very productive area of discussion.

We went into areas of cultural exchange, of how we can better work, universities, groups, scientists, and it is very interesting to know that some of the things we are doing now we can verify. For example, not too long ago we started a dairy goat research center at Prairie View A&M in the State of Texas, and some of the Mexican colleagues knew about that and some universities from Mexico have now worked with Prairie View A&M in doing research and promoting dairy goat expansion and upgrading the dairy goat breeds, for the dairy goat is very important because you not only get milk and cheese, it can also be used for meat, you can use the hide,

and you can raise maybe 20 or 30 dairy goats where you could have only one cow. So it is very important for developing countries. And those are the things we discussed.

On the border from Brownsville to Tijuana either the Mexican holiday or the American U.S. holiday is celebrated jointly, so on the border we have no problem, but it is going out that we were discussing exchanges, and so on, because on the border I guess we celebrate every chance we get, but it is jointly. Washington's birthday celebration in Laredo and Nuevo Laredo is a joint celebration. In Brownsville-Matamoros, we celebrate Washington, Lincoln, something called Charro Days, and they have a Mr. Amigo celebration during which the American side of the river honors a distinguished Mexican for his contribution to better relations as Mr. Amigo. And of course we know "amigo" means friend, Mr. Friend. And we have honored people from former Presidents of Mexico to movie actors to singers, distinguished ladies.

In our area, in McAllen where we live, Mission and McAllen, we have joint celebrations. The Mexican Independence Day, September 15, is celebrated on both sides of the border in many of our communities along the border.

So we discussed that, nuclear disarmament, and what it means to both sides. Mexico does not have the capability for atomic power or hydrogen power or nuclear power, but yet they were the leaders in the treaty of Thelolco where the Americans initiated the concept of nuclear free area and began there in Mexico. This is a very important step.

We agreed that this was not only a major concern for both our two countries but for the world, and they sometimes feel that we do not go fast enough, that we do not put a sufficient emphasis on disarmament and nuclear nonproliferation. But we are. It is just that the other side has not been as cooperative. And we explained that.

□ 1830

I told them that as one American, and I thought that I spoke for every American, that I did not want our country or any other country to disappear from this planet in a ball of flame, and our ashes in the cloud that would fertilize a planet with no humans. That is the interest, I am satisfied, of every American. I would prefer that we take every cannon and every ship and every tank and melt them into plows and hammers and picks and shovels to build up our two countries, and to help build up the world.

Later I will have another special order and invite members of the dele-

gation who accompanied me so that we might have a broader discussion. I give this as a preliminary discussion so that they might be apprised of my report, and then, with the other members, we will have a much broader report.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members for their attention and yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, May 16.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, May 20.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, May 23.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, May 16.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, May 20.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, May 21.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. McKINNEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RITTER, for 60 minutes, May 15.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, May 16.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DARDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORD of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUBBARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BURTON of California, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri in two instances.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. COATS.

Mrs. SNOWE.

Mr. SHUMWAY.

Mr. McDADE.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. O'BRIEN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DARDEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. COELHO.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. PENNY.

Mrs. BURTON of California in three instances.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. VENTO in two instances.

Mr. BARNES.

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida in two instances.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mr. MURTHA in two instances.

Mr. SMITH of Florida in two instances.

Mr. ROE in two instances.

Mr. RAY.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. ROBINO in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mrs. BOXER.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. CLAY.

Mrs. LONG.

Mr. SOLARZ.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution relating to the death of President-elect Tancredo Neves of Brazil; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 1985, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1285. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1985 and an amendment to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 99-87); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1286. A letter from the General Counsel, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the status of budget authority

proposed for rescission in the President's fifth special message, but for which Congress failed to pass a rescission bill, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 885; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1287. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on defense contractors and consultants who during the past 3 years held positions of GS-13 or above within the Department covering fiscal year 1984, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2397(e) (96 Stat. 1293) to the Committee on Armed Services.

1288. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the United States to collect health plan benefits for medical and dental care provided to dependents of active duty members, former members, and their dependents in facilities of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1289. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate general or flag officer grade requirements from certain statutory positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1290. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the Auditor's "Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1984", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1291. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of the addition of three further countries to the 63 named previously: India, Israel, and Pakistan to the Antiterrorism Assistance Program, pursuant to FAA, section 574(a)(1) (97 Stat. 972); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1292. A letter from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's development and audit report for fiscal year 1984, pursuant to FAA, section 240A (92 Stat. 216; 95 Stat. 1024); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1293. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1984, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1294. A letter from the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior, transmitting the fourth report on activities with respect to the emergency striped bass research study, for the year 1984, pursuant to Public Law 89-304, section 7(b) (93 Stat. 859); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1295. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, on Cape Fear River from Acme to Fayetteville, NC, together with other pertinent reports; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1296. A letter from the Acting United States Trade Representative, transmitting a copy of the March 22, 1984, "Decision of the Committee on Trade in Civil Aircraft," including the Consolidated Annex to the 1979 Agreement on Trade in Civil Aircraft attached to the decision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1297. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the study by the Advisory Panel on Alternative Means

of Financing and Managing Radioactive Waste Facilities entitled, "Managing Nuclear Waste—A Better Idea", pursuant to Public Law 97-425, section 303; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBEY: Joint Economic Committee. Report on February 1985 Economic Report of the President (Rept. No. 99-95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7. A bill to extend and improve the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 2245. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 1997. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FUQUA: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 2319. A bill to authorize appropriations for environmental research, development, and demonstration for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1789. A bill relating to the authorization of appropriations for certain components of the National Wildlife Refuge System; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1958. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Ocean Pollution Planning Act of 1978 and title II of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-101, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1890. A bill to provide for an equitable waiver in the compromise and collection of Federal claims (Rept. No. 99-102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 2121. A bill to provide for the reauthorization of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2434. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1408. A bill to amend the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 and title 38, United States Code, with respect to certain veterans' employment programs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2344. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make improvements in the National Cemetery System and in the Veterans' Administration program that provides assistance to certain disabled veterans in acquiring specially adapted residences, and to express the sense of Congress with respect to the Veterans' Administration home loan origination fee (Rept. No. 99-109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2343. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in veteran's compensation programs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2494. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1986 for construction, operation, and maintenance of water resources development projects under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers (Rept. No. 99-111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2493. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1986 (Rept. No. 99-112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 2348. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the activities of the Department of Justice for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 505. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the delivery of health care services by the Veterans' Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 10. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. (Rept. No. 99-115, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2478. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, to amend the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, to provide for the governance of the insular areas of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1905. A bill to offset the competitive advantage which foreign coal producers have as a result of not having to meet environmental, health, welfare and safety requirements of the kinds imposed on U.S. coal producers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-117, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2041. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian energy programs for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-118, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2416. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to construct a building on the U.S. Capitol Grounds to provide office space for the judicial branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2378. A bill to amend section 504 of title 5, United States Code, and section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to awards of expenses of certain agency and court proceedings, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2092. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968 and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-121, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ST GERMAIN: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. H.R. 2253. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Special Facility for Sub-Saharan Africa, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the African Development Fund; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 441. A bill to provide for the recovery by the United States of the costs of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1027. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Endangered Species Act of 1973 during fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 1349. A bill to reduce the costs of operating Presidential libraries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1383. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to take certain actions to improve the productivity of American farmers, and for other purposes; with an amend-

ment (Rept. No. 99-126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2355. A bill to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 1 year; with amendments (Rept. No. 99-127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1544. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the National Aquaculture Act of 1980 during fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than May 31, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule XI (Rept. No. 99-105, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAMILTON: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 2419. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than May 24, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(c), rule XI (Rept. No. 99-106, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1957. A bill to amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation for a period ending not later than July 19, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(p), rule XI (Rept. No. 99-107, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide survivor's annuities to certain employees' survivors not currently eligible for such annuities, and to provide for reductions in annuities otherwise due to persons likely to become such survivors and employees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2509. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to eliminate the "last employer" rule, and certain related rules, as they affect the portion of certain

annuities commonly referred to as "tier I" and to provide that certain deductions for work be made from such portion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide eligibility for annuities to divorced wives, not currently eligible, who would be eligible for a benefit under section 202(b) of the Social Security Act if their former husbands railroad service were included in employment for the purpose of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2511. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide that any worker with 25 years of service or more shall have a current connection for certain purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2512. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to increase the earnings limit for recipients of certain disability annuities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide for a trial work period in disability situations similar to that provided under the Social Security system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to provide benefits for certain disabled spouses of railroad employees and for certain spouses of disabled railroad employees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to modify the "years of service" credit for military service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to provide that unemployment benefits of railroad employees will not be reduced by reason of the receipt of certain unrelated social insurance benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend chapter 96 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS (by request):

H.R. 2518. A bill to discontinue or amend certain requirements for agency reports to Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 2519. A bill to discontinue or amend certain requirements for agency reports to Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COURTER (for himself, Mr.

DREIER of California, Mr. LAGOMARINO, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RUDD, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HILER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. WEBER, Mr. COATS, Mr. FISH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MONSON, Mr.

BADHAM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 2520. A bill to deny most-favored-nation trading status to Afghanistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 2521. A bill to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to regulate the market for Government securities; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2522. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to allow certain grants to be used for the overhaul of rolling stock and for reconstruction of equipment and materials on rolling stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2523. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist severely disabled individuals to attain or maintain their maximum potential for independence and capacity to participate in community and family life; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON of Washington

(for himself, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. REID, Mr. BOULTER, and Mr. COMBEST):

H.R. 2524. A bill to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish liability and indemnification for nuclear incidents arising out of Federal storage, disposal, or related transportation of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2525. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to establish certain requirements and restrictions respecting the retention and furnishing of information by consumer reporting agencies on individuals renting residential property; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 2526. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that, when any alcoholic beverage is advertised on television, radio, or cable, equivalent time shall be provided for public service announcements and programming regarding alcohol consumption and misuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 2527. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of the credit for dependent care expenses, to make such credit refundable, and to provide that certain respite care expenses are eligible for such credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2528. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that research and experimental expenditures of corporations, including personal holding companies, shall not be treated as items of tax preference for purposes of the minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2529. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny a deduction for amounts paid as restitution for other damages for violations of law involving fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRADISON (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. KENNELLY,

Mr. BARNES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STARK, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GROTH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HERTEL of Hawaii, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution to designate the month of November 1985 as "National Hospice Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enfranchisement of pretrial detainees, convicted misdemeanants, and persons appealing their convictions of crime; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and House Administration.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H. Res. 172. Resolution to recognize the Centennial Anniversary of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, A Premier Dairy Cattle Breed Organization; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BATES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H. Res. 173. Resolution providing for accelerated release for public use of certain records of the former Select Committee on Assassinations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

124. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the services of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

125. By Mr. RUDD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the prohibitions on commercial homework; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

126. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to a moratorium on nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

127. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to a policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

128. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to the end to apartheid in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

129. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to peaceful uses of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. By Mr. RUDD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the Juan Bautista De Anza Trail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

131. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of the State of Pennsylvania, relative to the issuance of a commemorative stamp; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

132. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to actions to assist schizophrenics; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Education and Labor; Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 10: Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 44: Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 512: Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 526: Mr. RODINO, Mr. FLORIO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 556: Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 587: Mr. BREAUX, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KRAMER, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 622: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 696: Mr. LUJAN, Mr. RUDD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. OLIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MARLENEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RITTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

H.R. 930: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1017: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1027: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1123: Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 1142: Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 1202: Mr. HUTTO and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1208: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 1294: Mr. FLORIO and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1436: Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 1517: Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. SENSENBRENER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 1550: Mr. YATRON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H.R. 1591: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. LUNDINE, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1666: Mr. DIODUARDI and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1760: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 1893: Mr. SHAW, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MICA, Mr.

RUDD, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, and Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 1957: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LENT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. BREAUX.

H.R. 1958: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

H.R. 1997: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 2106: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2121: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. BONKER, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2124: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SABO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 2161: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOODY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BARNES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2226: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KINDNESS, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2502: Mr. BEILSON.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. LUKE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WISE, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. CLINGER.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. PERKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.J. Res. 222: Mr. HAYES and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.J. Res. 281: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. REID, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MACK, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HILER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. FOLEY.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. TALLON.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. BOEHLERT and Mr. BONER of Tennessee.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

107. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Pastor Martin Hoover, Kempner, TX, relative to a redress of grievances; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

By Mr. WALKER:

—On page 146, after line 4, add the following section:

SEC. 1112. PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES OPPOSING UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than January 31 of each year, or at the time of the transmittal by the President to the Congress of the annual presentation of materials on foreign assistance, whichever is earlier, the President shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate a full and complete report which assesses, with respect to each foreign country, the degree of support by the government of each such country during the

preceding twelve-month period for the foreign policy of the United States. Such report shall include, with respect to each such country which is a member of the United Nations, information to be compiled and supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, consisting of a comparison of the overall voting practices in the principal bodies of the United Nations during the preceding twelve-month period of such country and the United States, with special note of the voting and speaking records of such country on issues of major importance to the United States in the General Assembly and the Security Council, and shall also include a report on actions with regard to the United States in important related documents such as the Non-Aligned Communiqué. A full compilation of the information supplied by the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations for inclusion in such report shall be provided as an addendum to such report.

(b) PROHIBITION.—The United States shall not provide any foreign assistance to any country which the President finds, based on the contents of the report required to be transmitted under subsection (a), is engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The United States shall not provide any foreign assistance to any country whose votes in the most recent session of the United Nations General As-

sembly differed from the United States position by more than 85 percent, based on the contents of the report required to be transmitted under subsection (a), unless the President certifies to the Congress that national security or humanitarian reasons justify a waiver of the application of this section to a country. The President shall submit each waiver certification to the Congress.

(d) DEFINITION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—As used in this section, the term "foreign assistance" means any assistance provided under—

(1) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.),

(2) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

H.R. 1872

By Mr. BROWN of California:

—At the end of title II (page 29, after line 14) add the following new section:

SEC. 207. LIMITATION ON TESTING OF ANTI-SATELLITE WEAPONS.

The Secretary of Defense may not carry out a test of the Space Defense System (anti-satellite weapon) against an object in space until the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has conducted, after the date of the enactment of this Act, a test against an object in space of a dedicated anti-satellite weapon. The prohibition in this section expires on October 1, 1986.